THE UNEXPURGATED *MEIN KAMPF**

HERBERT L. STEWART

I am in a state of innocence: I know no difference between good and evil.
—Bishop Nicholas, in Ibsen's *Pretenders*.

A GERMAN autobiography, in two different English translations, has reached us, with surely the most singular notice to recommend it which even the "jacket" of a publishing house has yet displayed. Messrs Reynal and Hitchcock beg us to bear in mind that all profits from the sales of their version will be applied for the benefit of the author's unhappy victims, while from Stackpole Sons, although they do not undertake to apply profits in that way, we have at least the assurance that no share in them will go to the author. Each publisher intimates that the new translation, unlike its predecessors, is "complete"—a point which it seems quite natural to emphasize. But the further epithet, "unexpurgated," on which each relies to secure a sale, is a distinct novelty in the advertisement of a book by the living ruler of a great nation in Europe. The translators have rendered signal service in reproducing for the English reader the full text of that strange manifesto, some of whose contents it is urgent that the foreigner should see, for just the same cause which makes the Nazi enthusiast wish to conceal them. In no ordinary or conventional sense is the public indebted for such timely work, so admirably done.

To the book thus pressed upon our notice, with the twofold recommendation that no translator or editor has abated the grossness of its original, and that no one who buys a copy will by this act financially benefit the author, I propose to devote a few pages of criticism.

I

The name, at least, is well chosen. Here is the record of a "struggle" by Adolf Hitler to change the *ethos* of his fellow-countrymen, whose spirit he observed to be in a state of decline in the years which immediately followed the Great War. He would reawaken

**Mein Kampf*, by Adolph Hitler, Reynal and Hitchcock (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart), 1939, $3.00.
Mein Kampf, by Adolph Hitler, Stackpole Sons, 1939, $3.00.

in their minds belief in the superior rights of their own race, in the duty of national self-assertion which this should impose, and in the ruthlessness needful to make it effective. How much sacrifice such change will demand in the tradition of the Christian Ages to which Germany once paid homage—a tradition of justice, mercy, mutual considerateness, good faith—is here made plain. *Mein Kampf*, illustrating General Ludendorff's thesis that "Christianity is incompatible with the new German national purpose," shows why such men as Pastor Niemoeller, Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop Waitz, and Karl Barth have been either silenced or intimidated.

It should likewise prove illuminating to tourists who, of late, have returned in such numbers from Germany, reporting how they heard everywhere, "Hitler gave us back our self-respect." They will discover from it just what Hitler has aimed to give back to his countrymen, what forms of thought and feeling and purpose he would reinspire in those from whom they had temporarily faded. It should show them how the self-respect which under the Weimar Republic had been lost, and under the Third Reich has returned, is not to be understood in terms of the familiar interpretation by our "broader-minded" British or American publicists: how it is quite unconnected with the intolerable indignity of Versailles, the monstrous figure set for Reparations, the occupation of the Ruhr, the behaviour of Senegalese troops at Cologne, and other matters of glib reproach against Great Britain and France. Thanks to Hitler's outspoken detail, and to the care with which the new translators have avoided expurgation, we know the sense in which their *Fuehrer* has bidden Germans respect themselves, and we realize the natural consequence of that mood for others. We have had examples, too. The fate of Czechoslovakia, the pogrom continuing year by year against Jews, the menace (growing darker and darker just now) to Poland, supply illustration for the chapter entitled "People and Race."

In it Hitler develops into definite theory, and adopts as the creed of his mature age, his instinctive feeling in youth that a German as such should dominate other nationalities. Even in his Austrian boyhood he had no patience with those of his own blood who were weak enough to doubt this, or to compromise with a lower order of mankind. A startling paragraph in *Mein Kampf* indicts above all in this matter the Archduke who fell at Serajevo, declaring that "the goddess of eternal justice" doomed him to fall by the

very bullets which he had himself contributed to mould, and that there was nothing to regret in the fate of one who had so helped the poison of foreign races to penetrate German nationality. How remote this picture is from the well-known facts about Francis Ferdinand, does not need to be pointed out. But *Mein Kampf* was written for circulation among those to whom no such facts were well known, and—as its author genially reflects—the task of one who would convince the public is "not to search into truth as far as this is favorable to others, in order to present it with doctrinal honesty, but rather to serve his own truth without interruption"!

In Hitler's "own" truth, then, the principle of German primacy is central, and his rage is ungovernable against those who question it. As a boy in that frontier town where, thirty-five years ago, he watched his father checking dutiable goods and writing customs reports, he used to dream of the time when the Germans in Austria would rejoin their kinsmen of old Germany, and the sentimental nonsense about equal rights for the lower cultures within the Austro-Hungarian Empire would be suppressed by the Teutonic mailed fist, imposing one language, one discipline, one national purpose. We have watched the dreamer fulfil his vision, up to a certain point. He wants to fulfil it still further, in the recovery of German colonies, and in eastward annexation of areas of "lower" culture. *Mein Kampf*, with its sections on Blood and Soil, in this complete translation, should be read by everyone in doubt about Nazi fitness for such trusteeship of a subject race.

II

Like the barber in *Gil Blas*, this autobiographer can account for the things he did on the ground that no man was ever less embarrassed by moral prejudices. But neglecting his bad ethnology and worse ethics (reproductions of Houston Stewart Chamberlain) which it has become tiresome even to expose, we can well understand a fascination in his book. In its critical as apart from its constructive chapters, *Mein Kampf* is not seldom penetrating, instructive, and—marvellous to relate—even witty. Unlike its author, who advises that effective attack should deny to an opponent any virtue whatever, I do not hesitate to applaud Hitler's analysis of the faults of parliamentary government, his characterization of the qualities and foibles of leaders, his resumé of the difficulties

which made the Weimar Republic fail, and his picture of the dexterity with which the first Nazis exploited the German temperament. It has long been beyond question that he, or the group of which he is perhaps no more than the spokesman, has extraordinary talent for mass-psychology at least among Germans: be it creditable or be it discreditable to him or to them, he is indeed just now their *Fuehrer*. What this book adds is evidence of very striking ability, either in himself or in a group which co-operated in its production, to describe how the psychological feat was achieved.

Plato, I think, or Dean Inge in one of his darker moods, would delight in its account of that freedom of the press which Hitler defines as "unpunishable lying;" in the story of how a "public opinion" favouring projects utterly different from what the public has at heart is created by the machinery of newspapers which a few men control, or of how the "intellectual robber barons" of the publishing interest determine for their own advantage the leaders who shall be puffed into popularity and the opponents who shall be defamed into impotence. It recalls Carlyle's conjecture about the book entitled *Satan's Invisible World Displayed*, that this must be a history of the British newspaper press!

Fit, too, at least for a place side by side with one of the *Latter-Day Pamphlets* is the descriptive passage in *Mein Kampf* about a general election campaign under the short-lived German Republic. The beloved people, says the narrator, has shown signs of revolt against the party in power; signs, that is, of a desire to slip out of the harness of the old party carriage: so the only thing to be done is to repaint the shafts! With this project in mind, the party star-gazers and astrologers are invoked for advice, men experienced and shrewd, rich in memory of like occasions when the patience of the masses had been exhausted, and of the respective results from certain methods of restoration:

> Thus the committees are formed, and they revise the old programme and issue a new one. . . . In it everybody is given what is everybody's. The peasant receives protection for his agriculture, the industrialist protection for his products, the consumer protection for his purchases; the teachers' salaries are increased, the official's pension is raised, widows and orphans are to be taken care of to the greatest extent by the State, traffic is promoted, the tariffs are to be lowered and even the taxes are to be abolished, though not completely, but almost. Sometimes it happens that one has nevertheless forgotten one class, or that one has not heard of a demand current among the people. Then at the last moment one patches in where there is room, until with a clear conscience one may hope that one has calmed and has greatly satisfied the host of the normal *bourgeoisie*

and their womenfolk. Thus armed in one's mind with confidence in the dear Lord and the unshakable stupidity of the *bourgeois* entitled to vote, one can begin the struggle for the "new shaping" of the Reich.

This is not the only passage, though perhaps the most obvious, in which Hitler reveals himself as the understudy of Mussolini. Unlike the *Duce*, the *Fuehrer* is not well read in books, but he has had close contact with one Italian mind fertile in satiric images for democracy. One mentor has coached him well in ridicule of the disproportion between national problems and party political methods. Here is the very spirit of Mussolini's personal memoir, about "parliamentary pea-shooting," about the plots in corridors and cloak-rooms and sidewalk cafés, about the tournament and joust for jobs.

It is the contention of both these dictatorial autobiographies that such faults of the democratic system (whose existence and gravity no intelligent democrat will deny) are enough to make despotism preferable in the countries they describe. Neither presumes to say that it is preferable for *all* countries, although Hitler has spoken somewhat suggestively of the signs he can see that those of his way of thinking may "get the upper hand in England." He said that in a highly propagandist speech, liable to the large discount he has warned us to impose on his speeches even as statements of his own opinion. Mussolini, one remembers, has definitely declared that "Fascism is not for export."

Still, a democrat must have some answer at least in mind to the claim of the dictatorial alternative. He will neither deny the truth of much in the anti-democratic indictment, nor underrate the value of an occasional presentation of these faults with the wild luxuriance of Nazi as of Carlylean rhetoric. But he will persistently urge that the faults of self-government in Great Britain, in the United States, in France, have not been so gross as even to excuse so desperate a remedy as return to despotism. Parliamentary corruption is bad enough, but not so bad as Nazi Concentration Camps, Fascist Islands of Banishment, or Bolshevist Blood Purges. Moreover, it is under despotism that corruption has its supreme chance, as the records after a despot's fall—the case of Napoleon III, for example—have so clearly shown. But if half a century of Italian parliaments and fourteen years of a German republic proved Germans and Italians to be, on the average, so much below the moral and intellectual prerequisite fulfilled by British, by French, by Americans,

that despotism is the least of evils for them, the observer in happier lands can but watch that scene, in the mood which Matthew Arnold has called "wonder and pitiful awe."

III

For one delightfully candid warning the reader should be thankful to the author of *Mein Kampf*. This is to the effect that the book is written by a publicist who has given special thought to the artifices of "propaganda," and who despises scruple about truthfulness where it is possible to deceive successfully for the cause one has at heart. In view of this, and of the abundant evidence by which in the last eighteen months it has been made clear that such is indeed the writer's character and habit, there can be no excuse for being misled by any statement of his on matters of fact. As Mr Neville Chamberlain has asked, who can take his word for anything again?

Here must be an almost unique disability imposed by an autobiographer on one who would make use of his book. It has to be judged wholly by the inner coherence and strength of its argument, on matters of fact for which we must turn to evidence quite otherwise obtained, because the writer has warned us that in "propaganda" he will deceive wherever he can do so advantageously for his "cause." There is much that is piquant, suggestive, instructive in it, despite these impediments to confidence, and in such matters to be forewarned is to be forearmed. But the translators have had a task of more than the usually exacting character in scrutinizing all passages within which such propagandist artifice may lurk. A conspicuous merit of the version issued by Messrs Reynal and Hitchcock is the running foot-note commentary by the ten American scholars who produced it, on highly imaginative sections of the text.

For example, when Hitler tells us how shocking was the contrast during the Great War between the multitude of Jews in paid jobs at home and the handful on service for the Fatherland at the battle-front, the translators provide a corrective from official German statistics. These show that the ratio of German Jews in fighting service was virtually the same as that of the general German population; that out of 550,000 (men, women, and children) 100,000 were in uniform, 12,000 were "casualties," 23,000 were promoted,

35,000 were decorated for bravery. Thus, as Browning once remarked, "Fancy strikes fact and explodes in full." This time it was not harmless, but malicious fancy! One remembers that the author has compared a publicist's office not so much to that of a witness in court, or to that of a scientist in his laboratory, as to that of the writer of advertisements for a special brand of soap. He must expect, then, that his product will meet with the severe, even suspicious analysis awaiting that of the advertiser.

This indeed presents what might be called, in the idiom of the Stock Exchange, a "new low" for literary work.

IV

Of most urgent interest in the whole book, and likewise—for the reasons just set forth—among the most difficult parts to judge, is the forecast it contains of coming German foreign policy. *Mein Kampf* is still circulated as a standard source from which Nazi purpose may be learned, and yet in the most explicit terms it condemns those aspirations after recovery of the German colonial empire which are today put forward by the *Fuehrer* in almost every speech, and whose satisfaction he now declares vital to the peace of Europe! Is he, in one of these roles, for some considered but hidden purpose, affecting convictions he does not hold? If so, was it when he bade his readers forget that Germany ever had a colonial development, and concentrate on the two projects of humiliating France and pillaging Russia, that he spoke his real mind? Or is he sincere only now, when he declares that he has no further territorial designs in Europe and no outstanding quarrel with France, but will never rest nor allow others to rest until the colonies of which Germany was robbed are given back to her? If he has changed his mind, he has never said so, but has professed an unbroken unity of purpose throughout. One is forced, then, to choose. It recalls the question put by a friend to Dr Johnson, about a talker of notorious unveracity. "Don't you think that half of what he says may be true?" "I daresay," replied Johnson, "but it is impossible to tell which half."

In this instance, however, it is imperative for certain countries, intimately concerned, to judge which is at least the more probable direction of Nazi foreign policy. Everything now indicates that the two demands which in the *Fuehrer's* earlier and more limited

programme he set in conflict are now to be pressed forward simultaneously, each indeed as supplementing the other. Since the seizure of Austria and the conquest of Czechoslovakia, no one alludes except in scorn to his disavowal—so shortly before these enterprises were carried out, and when they must have been in actual preparation—of further territorial ambitions there. And the colonies project is now from time to time isolated, not only in his own speeches but in those of his lieutenants, as if it must take precedence of every other.

Of late, in conjunction with his Italian ally, Hitler has adopted the slogan about "Vital Spaces." Perhaps the *Duce* invented it, or adapted it from the motto of Kaiser Wilhelm II about Germany's need for "a place in the sun." But here at least *Mein Kampf* was earlier by many years in the announcement. The foreign-policy aims of National Socialism, says chapter XIV, of volume II, are to secure for the German nation "the soil and territory to which it is entitled on this earth." What soil, and what territory, does that include? In one of his few moods of pious diction, the *Fuehrer* specified how this must be determined:

> This is the only action which, before God and our German posterity, would seem to justify an investment of blood: before God, since we are placed in this world on condition of an eternal struggle for daily bread, as beings to whom nothing shall be given and who owe their position as lords of the earth only to the genius and courage with which they know how to struggle and defend it: before our German posterity, however, in so far as we spill no citizen's blood except that out of it a thousand others are bequeathed to posterity.

Read in conjunction with the passage about Germany's eastward destiny, these lines would seem to indicate to Poland and to Russia that the sooner they secure allies in a Halt-Hitler Front, the better.

V

The Nazi, like the Fascist, movement has thrilled outside observers by its success. For those whose only interest in a movement is to judge (in time for appropriate action) whether it will be successful, the Dictators are vindicated by their long tenure of power. Often in the very spirit of Mussolini (following Machiavelli, his acknowledged mentor) our realist critics imply by their language that any cause is wrong if it loses, right if it wins, "right" and "wrong" having no significance other than this—except for idealists

like Mr Eden, M. Leon Blum, or President Roosevelt. But seldom will a pro-Fascist or a pro-Nazi apologist put the case quite so crudely, in so many clear words, to a British audience, and even the most daring of English newspapers desirous to serve the dictatorial interest will still—at least on pressure—repudiate this sheer identification of the right with the successful. The familiar argument is rather that sustained local support of Hitler and Mussolini should make a modest foreign critic pause in his wholesale condemnation. Surely it is more likely that he has in some degree misunderstood the movement, or made insufficient allowance for its environing circumstances, than that the conflict of "ideologies" is so sharp? Lord Londonderry's book, *Germany and Ourselves*, is an example of such admonition. One remembers, too, the initial warning from the Archbishop of Canterbury to his colleagues in conference, that they should make earnest search for some element of truth and value in the Nazi creed.

For such search these two translations, so laboriously and skilfully executed, provide indispensable assistance. Their appearance must, I think, have been awaited with apprehension by the pro-dictatorial groups, British, French, and even American, whose constant argument has been that Hitler's services (especially against Communism) are manifest, while his faults would no doubt be explicable by fuller knowledge of local circumstance. Here, then, is that fuller knowledge, presented by Hitler himself, as his own advocate, more damning by far than the case set forth by his enemies. Like many other counsel, his British and French representatives must be deeply chagrined at their client's insistence on being a witness. And how they must deplore the American diligence which would not leave any part of his evidence in the obscurity of the original German!

Of those who are not his special pleaders, but honestly concerned to do him justice as against national prejudice, one gladly acknowledges that their habit of criticism is of the sort whose failing leans to virtue's side. But Mrs Cadwallader, in *Middlemarch*, had her own vein of wisdom when she regretted that charitable people so seldom knew vinegar from wine till they drank it and got the colic. It is a stage worse to impose colic on others by continued insistence on such experimental drinking. At the very least, we may feel that the draughts by this time have been experimentally enough.

RECENT TRENDS IN HISTORICAL THOUGHT

R. Flenley

HISTORY is the way we look at the past, and in so doing we are conditioned by time, place, and circumstance. Although we may and do speak of "objective" history, the objectivity is relative: we cannot in this twentieth century write history from the eighteenth-century point of view, much less from that of earlier ages. All written history reflects in some degree the personal, "subjective" point of view of the writer, and, more obviously, all sorts of social, national, political, or religious influences to which we are exposed. Even the recognition of this (which recognition is in itself a part of our view of life today) does not emancipate us from our environment. Hence history cannot be written once for all: it must be rewritten from generation to generation, as time moves on, and the point of view changes. It is therefore worth while to ask: how has historical thought developed in recent times, and what are its trends today?

For our purpose we need not go behind the eighteenth century, when history, so to speak, grew up. A Scottish historian, Hume, wrote in 1770, "I believe this to be the true historical age and this the historical nation." Yet the next century criticized the eighteenth century for its unhistorical character, much as we berate the Whig historians of the nineteenth. Certainly the era before the French Revolution was unhistorical (or a-historical) in its appeal to reason, to humanity, to natural men and natural rights. But it none the less achieved for historical thought and writing far more than the succeeding age was willing to admit. Thus it collected and made available large masses of new historical material, as a glance at the foot-notes to Gibbon makes clear. It criticized its sources with a freedom and keenness of scrutiny unknown to earlier ages, and it produced several of the earliest treatises on historical method. It also wrote a good deal of first-rate history, for which Gibbon, again, will serve as an example. It developed, primarily in Voltaire, an interest in what has come to be called "cultural" history. And finally, it sought to write universal history, and to arrive thereby at a philosophy of history. These are large and solid achievements, not to be brushed aside because we do not today accept the aforesaid philosophy of history.

* * * * *

The historical thought and writing of the nineteenth century were directly and profoundly influenced by the great forces of that complicated period, its liberalism and democracy, its growing nationalism, its science, industrialism, and world expansion. Briefly, we may distinguish three major developments in historical work during this period, all of them closely related to, or affected by, the general influences of the century.

(i) In the first place there was a steady and continuous growth of interest in the subject, and, as a result, of historical-mindedness. History, as someone has put it, had its industrial revolution, which brought greatly enlarged production of historical works. The classical revival brought increased interest in "ancient" history; the Catholic revival and what we loosely call the Romantic Movement helped the "middle" ages to live again. Getting away after Hegel from the philosopher-historians, historical writing went forward under its own steam, becoming more professional as the study developed in the universities, plunging with great vigour into the *chasse aux documents*, and applying more rigid canons of criticism. Its exponents claimed to be more objective, so that they saw past events "as they actually occurred," to use the phrase of Ranke, the great master of this whole movement. Yet this growing stream reflected, plainly enough, the nationalism of the age: Guizot saw France as the focus of European civilization, Macaulay found liberty incarnated in English history, Germany had its Prussian school culminating in Treitschke.

More than this general interest in historical study is, however, implied here. The growth of historicism (historism would be a useful translation of the German *Historismus*) implied an increasing adoption of the historical point of view, of the belief that the study of the past provided the safest guide and key to the political, social, and cultural problems of the present. This view, indeed, has come to be regarded (by Troeltsch, for example, in his *Historismus und seine Probleme*, 1922, p. 104) as one of the characteristics of our Western civilization, as a feature in which it differs from other and earlier civilizations.

(ii) The adoption of the historical point of view in the nineteenth century is obviously bound up with the growth of natural science, above all with biology and the theory of evolution. True, both the historical point of view and the theory of evolution had been emerging before 1859, when Darwin published *The Origin of Species by Means*

of Natural Selection. But his exposition, and the subsequent spread and development of the doctrine, undoubtedly exerted a great influence on historical ideas. "No other part of science," declares Marvin, "affected so powerfully as did the theory of evolution the development of the historical spirit." The tendency grew to (as Bury put it) "merge history in a larger perspective of development." The apparent infallibility of scientific proof, its all-embracing claims, led even Acton to declare, in a famous Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge in 1895, that men of science "can tell us how to test proof, how to secure fulness and soundness in deduction, how to restrain and how to employ with safety hypothesis and analogy. Theirs is the logic of discovery, the demonstration of the advance of knowledge, and the development of ideas." And as the influence of biology was reinforced by the emergence of new sciences closely related to history, such as anthropology, sociology, geography, and psychology, then history itself began to be regarded as a science, subject to laws as fixed and irrevocable as those of natural science. "History," to quote Bury again, this time from his own Inaugural at Cambridge in 1903, "has really been enthroned amongst the sciences."

(iii) Connected evidently enough with both the foregoing developments, and drawing strength and inspiration from the growth of industrialism and of democracy, came a steadily increasing concern with social and economic history. The centre of interest began to move from rulers to ruled, from palace and parliament to hovel and factory. Historians began to inquire more closely into the organization of society and the conditions under which people lived and worked. This was perhaps less new than has sometimes been suggested. No historian of the Protestant Reformation, the Puritan Revolution, the American and French Revolutions, could omit "the people." Yet, though both Carlyle and Macaulay in the first half of the century were alive to the import of social conditions in historical development, the appearance, in 1874, of John Richard Green's *Short History of the English People* marked a more definite trend, and one which grew steadily stronger. Following the rise of the economists, economic history emerged as almost a separate subject. Textbook histories became "political and *social*" surveys, spades and spinning-wheels began to replace sceptres and trumpets. The rise of Socialism, of course, played its part. As the "fourth estate" became more self-conscious, its champions began to investigate its

history, to find stimulus in the record of early champions of social freedom and equality from Wat Tyler to Baboeuf. Marx, generalizing from his view of the industrial revolution, saw historical development as dependent upon the form of economic production in vogue, with the class struggle as the incentive to change. Though Marx was, at bottom, less an historian than a social theorist, his influence on historical ideas was nevertheless of importance.

* * * * *

When we come to our own time, with its welter of conflicting ideals, we find it difficult to distinguish any clear trends in historical thought, save that it is characterized, like all else in the world of today, by its continuous and restless activity. Yet there are undoubtedly certain general tendencies, in part the continuation of earlier ones, in part new. Of the former, most obvious is the continuation, and even increase, of the accumulation of historical material and its setting forth. Together with this, however, has come a newer distrust of the historical point of view. And finally there have appeared new attempts at historical synthesis.

There is little need to enlarge upon the continued expansion of historical work. Never has there been so much historical research of every kind. Historians, like novelists, have felt the danger of being "gravelled for lack of matter" and so have sought for newer and remoter fields, or have intensified their scrutiny to unearth ever new masses of facts. At the same time history has become more popular, and lay writers, not always with the professional historian's respect for accuracy, have come to the aid of the historian, blurring the lines separating history from other forms of literature, including fiction. Never has there been so much interest in the individual in history, as the vogue of biography shows. True the tempo has quickened, and there seems at first sight less room for the full-length portrayals of an earlier age. But, in fact, such works continue to be written, though a future generation must decide as to their immortality. Many special branches of history have appeared, or grown to adult stature, such as the history of art, of literature, of science, of philosophy, of education, economic history, no longer content to be "auxiliary sciences" for history, but demanding rooms (if not houses) of their own. Archaeology has developed enormously, as has anthropology.

What is noteworthy here is the way in which these two subjects

have drawn closer to history proper: the archaeologist has connected the earlier civilizations of western Asia with the Ancient World of the historians; the anthropologist has charted the course of primitive man from the withdrawal of the ice sheet to the beginnings, and more, of civilization. Thus the claims on the historical student have been markedly increased. At one end of the time scale pre-history has become history, and Sumer and Akkad, the caves of Altamira and Peking man, become of importance for him. At the other there is the demand for an understanding of "contemporary history," with its bewilderingly rapid succession of events of world importance, from Manchukuo to Madrid. It is little wonder that the historian is in danger of being engulfed by the ever-swelling tide of historical knowledge.

Together with this many-sided and limitless curiosity about the past of mankind there has also appeared, however, a reaction against the "objective" history of the nineteenth century, and indeed against the dominance of the historical point of view. As long ago as 1874, Nietzsche (in the *Use and Abuse of History*) attacked the "excess" of history as one of the maladies of his age, for which the "objective" professors of history, burrowing in the ground like moles, were responsible. More recently, the upheaval of the War and post-War period, and the threat to the political and economic systems of the nineteenth century, contributed to weaken faith in the view of the past which had grown up and been accepted in that more stable period. The Marxist doctrine of the inevitable class struggle, with revolution as its weapon, plainly contradicted the Victorian conception of freedom slowly broadening down by peaceful evolution. New social and political gospels required new interpretations of the past. Troeltsch (*Historismus*, p. 97) remarks how more peaceful times, with more generally accepted standards of values, encourage a more apparently "objective" treatment of history, whereas in eras of revolution men are apt to regard such objective research as narrow pedantry, and to demand new interpretations of the past to support their immediate aims.

Obviously the revolutions in Austria, Germany, and Italy called for a revaluation and rewriting of the histories of those countries. And whereas any student of nineteenth-century history could predict the downfall of the Hapsburg empire on the death of Francis Joseph I, the crash of Bismarck's empire contradicted the accepted views of most German historians. And no sooner had the Weimar

republic revised the pattern of recent German history to bring it more in accord with democratic, republican views than the advent of Hitler to power caused another and no less violent swing of the historical pendulum. The Russian Revolution, and the Bolshevist victory there, inevitably involved a break with Tsarist history as well as with the political and economic life of the Tsarist régime. The controversies over the origins of, and responsibilities for, the War of 1914 might well encourage scepticism as to the possibilities of arriving at "objective" truth even for recent events, and when a plethora of first-hand material was available.

Thus there came attacks on existing historical views and methods as inadequate, bound to the old order, and failing to provide a "guide through world chaos." Historians had, indeed, never claimed to do this. The complaints were in part due to the reluctance of many historians to attach themselves to the newer faiths. The Italian philosopher Croce, in 1930, drew attention to this growth of anti-historicism. He saw its expression in futuristic art, symbol of a future without a past, with strength and action as ends in themselves; and in the opposition of those who, disliking the variable individual in history, seek to overcome historicism by turning to absolute values. Ortega, the Spanish philosopher, in *The Revolt of the Masses*, 1932, sees society as having moved out from an historical age which revered its past, into a primitive one which rather desires to destroy the past, in order to live more fully and freely in the present. Criticism of the historical approach has likewise come from other quarters. Theologians have protested against an over-emphasis of the historical point of view in the study of the Christian faith. Students of English literature have likewise revolted against the tendency to look at literature too much in terms of its historical environment, so making it a mere handmaiden to history, to the neglect of other values.

Finally, recent developments in science have affected history. The decline from the feeling of certainty manifest in science in the latter part of the nineteenth century has had its effect upon historical thought: when natural science began to admit doubts about its laws, human history could hardly claim a higher infallibility. The evolution hypothesis became more complicated, leading less obviously to a simple law of human progress along a straight line. The nineteenth-century supremacy of biology, with its more obvious relation to human history, was challenged by the renewed activity

of physics and astronomy, and in their thinner, more abstract atmosphere the shortcomings of history as a science were more manifest. Whilst all historians clung to "scientific method," those who wished to emphasize a closer connection with science were forced to content themselves with being "social" scientists—whatever that might mean. Others, however, were more inclined to agree with the expression of a philosophically minded historian, Dr Ernest Barker, that "the natural world is one thing, the human world is another; and natural science one thing and human history another."

Yet this "crisis of *Historismus*" has another and more constructive side; for it has brought attempts at the formulation of new syntheses of history. Some of these reconstructions of the past are, as we have seen, a natural and indeed necessary accompaniment to such new political and social faiths as communism or fascism. But they represent more than this. They are, in part, an attempt to avoid being swamped by the overwhelming mass of historical material accumulated by the armies of research workers. They illustrate what Toynbee (*Study of History*, I, p. 49) calls "the rhythmic alternation between two activities—the collection of materials and their arrangement, the finding of facts and their interpretation." They also constitute a response to the broadened stage of the life of today, with its increased rapidity of intercommunication of every kind, and its ever-increasing world interdependence. The War of 1914-18 was a "world" war as no previous war had been. It was shortly after that war that H. G. Wells produced an *Outline of History*, designed (as the preface declares) "primarily to show that history as one whole is amenable to a more broad and comprehensive handling than is the history of special nations and periods." Wells's quicker mind and more facile pen anticipated the trend. The historians followed, with graver tread and less positive opinions. Hence the past decade or so has witnessed the appearance of many attempts to survey the whole of human history, whether in one volume or in twenty, by single individuals or as composite works by more specialized scholars. This tendency has not, of course, checked or even interrupted the work of historical research. Nor do all historians find any easily visible pattern in history, still less ineluctable laws. H. A. L. Fisher, in the preface to his recent brilliant survey of European history, sees in history but "one emergency following upon another as wave follows wave," with "the play of the contingent

and the unforeseen" as the one unassailable generalization of the historian.

World history, if it is to be written (and it has been argued both that *all* history is universal history, and on the other hand that it is impossible to write universal history) must be written rather differently from the history of single countries, epochs, or individuals. It needs a broader brush, a larger perspective, to some extent even different values. Political values are too narrow; social and economic values are not deep and all-inclusive enough; religion, art, literature do not by themselves provide adequate bases. Hence most of these new syntheses have depicted, or professed to depict, human history in terms of culture, using that term in its broadest sense, as comprehending all the elements that go to make a civilization. Cultural history (like its nineteenth-century counterpart, social history) is not new. Voltaire was its most obvious founder. The Swiss historian Burckhardt helped to create it for Germany, where its claims were long the subject of acute controversy. In our own day Spengler claims to have discovered that history is "the drama of a number of mighty cultures." Although historians in general do not accept either Spengler's cyclical view of history, with its rigid determinism, or his dogmatic exposition of the manner in which the various cultures have expressed themselves, yet it is undeniable that Spengler has helped to give greater emphasis and recognition to the cultural elements in history. This same interest is evidenced in the more empirical *Study of History* (as yet uncompleted) of Toynbee, wherein also the influence of recent developments in anthropology and archaeology is plainly to be seen. Toynbee begins by accepting the view that history must concern itself with the study of civilization, of "societies" such as our Western society. He then proceeds to identify the civilized (as distinct from primitive) societies which have inhabited or now inhabit the earth, to account for their emergence, to study the causes of their growth, and (in future volumes) their decline.

The appearance of histories of civilization may suggest a return to our starting point in the eighteenth century. Yet our knowledge of the history of mankind is very greatly increased since the days when Voltaire and Herder wrote universal histories. Indeed this very increase, and the greater appreciation of the gaps that still remain in the story, have raised doubts, of which the Age of the Enlightenment was innocent, as to the possibility of writing world

history in any complete sense. And, partly for this reason, historians are less ready than the men of the Enlightenment to formulate or to accept general philosophies of history. For whilst there is no lack of evidence of the desire to arrive at general views about the past of mankind, and to relate this to the present and even the future, we are at the same time more conscious of the relativity of historical thought, of the inevitable subjectiveness of historical writing. Nor have our efforts at synthesis so far kept pace with our growing accumulation of facts. When that happens we may perhaps achieve both universal history and a valid philosophy of history.

THAT SHEPHERD, WHO FIRST TAUGHT THE CHOSEN SEED

A NOTE ON MILTON'S MOSAIC INSPIRATION

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD

I

IN the third of Milton's plans for a drama on the subject of the fall of man there occurs a notation which challenges attention by its oddity, and which, like so many other items in the Trinity Manuscript, proves on examination to have a more than curious interest in relation to the poet's finished art. This notation is an amplification of the first entry, "Moses προλογίζει," and may well have been added after the rest of the third outline stood complete. Moses prologuizes, "recounting how he assum'd his true bodie, that it corrupts not because of his [converse][1] with god in the mount, declares the like of Enoch and Eliah, besides the purity of the pl[ace][2] that certaine pure winds, dues, and clouds praeserve it from corruption, whence [he] exhorts[2] to the sight of god, tells they cannot se Adam in the state of innocence by reason of thire sin."

It is evident from the cancellations and substitutions in the several drafts that Milton found difficulty in deciding what character would most appropriately speak the opening lines of his proposed drama. In the first plan the name of Michael stands alone at the head of the list of *dramatis personae*; in the second Milton originally wrote "Michael," then "Moses or Michael," then "Moses" without comment or addition. The third draft, as we have seen, shows him apparently confirmed in the idea of a prologue spoken by Moses rather than by Michael, but in the fourth he has returned more nearly to his original intention, substituting first an angelic Chorus, who serves a purely dramatic purpose, then the archangel Gabriel, whom he equips with a part of the philosophical discourse

[1]Some such word is omitted. There is no gap between "his" and "with."

[2]The Columbia edition (XVIII, p. 229) reads "whence he hasts," but "exhorts" is certainly correct. The "ex," now missing in the MS. owing to damage to the margin appears in Sotheby's facsimile, made in 1661. There is no space for the "he." See *Ramblings in Elucidation of the Autograph of Milton*, plate IV.

earlier assigned to the prophet.[3] Finally, if we can trust Phillips, Milton threw over all these preliminary suggestions and began his tragedy directly with Satan's address to the Sun.[4]

These alterations in intent raise many interesting questions, which I do not find discussed in Schork's elaborate study of the dramatic plans.[5] My present concern with them is limited to their bearing on Milton's conception of his mission as a poet and the theory which he built up regarding the character and authenticity of his inspiration.

That Milton was concerned by this problem is obvious. He deemed himself, as Grierson says, a prophet, "something even more, because more expressly inspired than such a philosophical poet as he supposed Spenser to be."[6] The elaborate set of biblical and other associations which he brought to the support of the idea that his artistic calling was of God may be traced throughout his writings, and it is possible by analysis of the available materials to reconstruct many of his deliberative processes. The Mosaic prologue is particularly important because it was written at the time when Milton first felt himself ready to attempt his long-projected masterpiece and when his mind was most actively engaged in assembling the relevant ideas and images. It anticipates by many years the completed *De Doctrina Christiana*, which contains a reasoned statement of his beliefs. Taking it therefore as the text for a discussion supplementary to the studies of Grierson and others, let us examine point by point the ideas which the poet puts into the mouth of his inspired historian. The enquiry introduces us at once to certain motives which ultimately find their place in *Paradise Lost*.

[3]In this fourth draft, which takes the form of a synopsis rather than an annotated list of characters, Milton originally wrote: "First the Chorus shewing the reason of his coming to keep watch in Paradise after Lucifer's rebellion." The revision reads: "The Angel Gabriel, either descending or entering shewing since this globe was created, his frequency as much in Earth as in heav'n, describes Paradise next the Chorus," etc.

[4]Phillips says that the verses beginning "O thou that with surpassing glory crown'd" (*Paradise Lost*, IV, 32ff.) were designed for "the very beginning of the said tragedy." It is quite possible that Phillips was mistaken and that these lines, if they were actually written in the 1640's, would have appeared, as the equivalent utterance does in Andreini, at the opening of a later scene. In all four of Milton's drafts Satan enters only after much allegorical pageantry and choric song.

[5]Walther Schork, *Die Dramenpläne Miltons*, Quakenbrück, 1934.

[6]Sir Herbert Grierson, *Milton and Wordsworth, Poets and Prophets*, 1937, p. 26.

Moses recounts, first, "how he assum'd his true bodie, that it corrupts not because of his [converse] with god in the mount, declares the like of Enoch and Eliah." This is a complex of scriptural passages on which the poet had meditated deeply. The death and burial of Moses are given in Deuteronomy 34. 1-6:

> And Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho. And the Lord shewed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan. . . . So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-Peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.

"And he buried him" is the rendering of the King James and the Revised versions. The Septuagint and various modern translations have "he was buried." A verse in Jude[7] speaks obscurely of a dispute over Moses' body between Michael the archangel and Satan. The association of Moses and Elijah is already made in the gospel account of their appearance with Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration. It was easy for Milton to add Enoch, who was, like Elijah, taken in the flesh by God, and to contemplate all three as having miraculously possessed their true bodies after death. The problem of the relation of body and spirit was, as every student of Milton knows, one which came to interest him profoundly. He shared the heresy of the mortalists or soul-sleepers, who believed that there was no separation. The whole man dies. At the last day soul and body are revived together. The translation of Enoch and Elijah were, therefore, special and unique acts of God, prefiguring the resurrection. The restoration of a true body to Moses would be the same.[8]

[7]"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee" (Jude 9).

[8]Milton speaks of Enoch and Elijah as prefigurations (the one before, the other after the law) of the perfect glorification which is effected in eternity (*De Doctrina Christiana*, I, xxxiii). Moses is mentioned as a type of Christ in *De Doctrina*, I, ix. It is an open question how far Milton had gone in these theological formulations in the early 1640's. We learn from Phillips that the collecting and ordering of the scriptural texts was in progress during these years. He was, of course, already familiar with the traditions of orthodox theology. But however much he may have been helped by suggestions from such sources, the imaginative processes of his mind are different from the purely intellectual, and when Milton was meditating the dramatic plans, he already had, in anticipation, "his singing robes about him," though, as we shall see, he was capable of checking himself before the "spacious circuit of his musings" was complete.

Milton must have seized with delight on the support which the scriptural references, with their implication of a mystery connected with the burial of Moses, afforded for the idea. It came to him originally, perhaps, from a clearer, though a less authoritative source. There was a tradition, based on the lost Book of the Assumption of Moses, that the prophet's body was actually taken by God, and it is to this event that the passage in Jude presumably refers. Milton would have known this tradition through allusions in the Fathers, and especially through Josephus, who elaborates as follows on the scriptural account: "Now when they were come to the mountain called Abarim, situated over against Jericho, . . . he [Moses] dismissed the senate, and as he was going to embrace Eleazar and Joshua, and was still discoursing with them, a cloud stood over him on a sudden, and he disappeared in a certain valley, although he wrote in the holy books that he died, which was done out of fear lest they should say that, because of his extraordinary virtue, he went to God."[9]

Such, then, was Milton's justification for conceiving of Moses as having been exempt from the law of man's mortality and capable, like Christ and the angels, of appearing on earth in a form of incorruption. There is, however, an additional element in his thought on the subject which could not have been derived explicitly either from scripture or from Josephus and which is the more significant on that account. Moses is made in Milton's manuscript notation to explain his condition, not by the theory of translation or resurrection, but as a kind of magical result of his association with the divine presence on the Mount and the consequent sanctification of the region itself. His body "corrupts not," he says, "because of his [converse] with god in the mount, besides the purity of the pl[ace] that certaine pure winds, dues, and clouds praeserve it from corruption." Milton is, perhaps deliberately, a little obscure here. The suggestion seems to be that Moses' body was miraculously preserved after a natural death in his burial place in Moab, but this idea is contradicted by the implications of the reference to Elijah and Enoch, and it would offer difficulties to Milton's general metaphysics. It would be easier for him to believe that Moses had always lived, sojourning in some terrestrial paradise, the earthly

[9] *Antiquities of the Jews*, IV, viii, p. 49. For other references to the material, see R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1913, II, p. 408, and R. H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses*, 1897.

counterpart of Heaven or interchanging such abode with Heaven itself.

That this is his real drift will be apparent if we consider for a moment Milton's general angelology and the poetic use he makes of the heavenly visitant in his early work. He was evidently fascinated by the idea of the guardian angel, which supplied a need to his imagination and was capable of conversion into a philosophic symbol of great speculative import. The idea appears in one of his earliest English poems, "On the Death of a Fair Infant," when he asks:

> Or wert thou of the golden-wingèd host,
> Who having clad thyself in human weed,
> To earth from thy prefixèd seat didst post,
> And after short abode fly back with speed,
> As if to show what creatures Heaven doth breed,
> Thereby to set the hearts of men on fire
> To scorn the sordid world, and unto Heaven aspire.[10]

It is a main motive in *Comus*, where the attendant spirit is both the expositor and the chief instrument of the action. At the close of *Lycidas* the conception of the guardian angel is fused with that of the Roman tutelary spirit:

> Henceforth thou art the Genius of the shore
> In thy large recompense, and shalt be good
> To all that wander in that perilous flood.[11]

These early uses are more or less poetic, even rhetorical, though a tentative element of faith is implicit in them. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton grapples firmly with the nature of spirits, making Raphael explain to Adam that the angels are of a refined materiality, capable of partaking of human food, and of enjoying physical love in a manner analogous to that of men. There is no room in Milton's stricter theology for a disembodied soul like that of Edward King. But the well-known passage in *Comus* in which the Elder Brother expounds the sage and serious doctrine of virginity and proclaims its effect of converting the body to soul's essence enshrines an idea which Milton is willing for the moment to retain, without attempting to adjust it too precisely to his responsible Christian thinking. As a hypothesis of what might have been had the world remained

[10] *The Poems of John Milton*, edited by James Holly Hanford, New York, 1936, "On the Death of a Fair Infant," ll. 57-63.

[11] *Poems*, "Lycidas," ll. 183-5.

free from sin, it reappears in *Paradise Lost*, where the angel promises to Adam and Eve that, if they persevere in innocence, their bodies

> may at last turn all to spirit,
> Improved by tract of time, and winged ascend
> Ethereal, as we, or may at choice
> Here or in heavenly Paradises dwell.[12]

This brings us back to the prologue of Moses, which seems to me to exhibit Milton's thought, if not in process of formation, at least in process of adaptation to imaginative use in a dramatic elaboration of scripture. The poet is really trying to make Moses perform the function not only of a patriarch but of an angel, and in order to do so he must explain him philosophically. His holy life and his oft converse with heavenly habitants have made him immortal. The place of his earthly contact with the divine, sanctified and protected from the effects of sin, is a fitting abode for his ethereal nature. The difficulties of the idea were apparently too much for Milton. After toying with it he gave Moses up in favour of the safer Gabriel,[13] who nevertheless finds it necessary to raise the Platonic problem by explaining his frequency on the newly created Earth.

It is interesting to observe how the biblical associations are here adjusted to and made to support the poetic tradition of a mystic garden, the dwelling place of innocent men and heavenly spirits. This tradition, which Milton had employed in *Comus* and was later to incorporate in his description of the Garden of Eden, has its origin in antiquity and came to him from many sources. More than one of the imaginary gardens is on a mountain, and it was easy for Milton to join with them not only Pisgah, but also Oreb or Sinai, where Moses received the law, and finally the New Testament Mount of Transfiguration itself. We may be sure that he missed none of the

[12] *Poems*, "Paradise Lost," V, 497-500.

[13] Had Milton shared the vagaries of Henry More and Joseph Glanvil he could easily have brought Moses up from the tomb or down from Heaven to address an earthly audience. But his agreement with the Cambridge Platonists as to the nature of the spirit world stopped short of belief in the return of the dead to earth. He obviously could not take even scripture as warrant for a practical acceptance of ghosts, and after the writing of the *Epitaphium Damonis* he never allows himself to use the idea of the survival of blessed or unblessed human souls before the resurrection, even as a rhetorical fiction. We have already noted that Moses, Elijah, and Enoch are interpreted as prefigurations. He wisely ignored the Witch of Endor and her invocation of the spirit of Saul, along with the other biblical data on which the Anti-Sadducees based their argument.

relevant scriptural texts in his early meditation on these matters, even if they are not cited in the *De Doctrina*.[14]

> Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground (Exodus 3. 5). And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai: for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it (Exodus 19. 23). And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle (Exodus 33. 9). And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias: Who appeared in glory. . . . And it came to pass, as they departed from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles: one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said. While he thus spake, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud (Luke 9. 30-4).

These texts fuse with each other in Milton's thought and it is impossible to trace them individually in the brief note for Moses' prologue, but the mention of a pure cloud, which, with the airs and dews, invests the place of his burial, surely carries a recollection not only of the pillar of cloud on Oreb but also of its counterpart on the Transfiguration mount. The whole body of material, scriptural and other, undergoes an immense elaboration in the description of the terrestrial Paradise, itself a mountain, in the fourth book of *Paradise Lost*.

The final clause in the quotation from the Trinity Manuscript carries us further in our exploration of the sources of Milton's thought. Moses is to conclude by exhorting to the sight of God and telling the audience that they cannot see Adam and Eve in the state of innocence by reason of their sin, or "by reason of sin," as Milton originally wrote. One is at first tempted to see in this a mere piece of dramatic preparation, with a bit of conventional Christian moralizing thrown in. Adam and Eve do not appear in the plan till Act IV. Acts I and II are filled with the pageantry of Heaven and a choric description of Paradise. The action begins with the appearance of Lucifer in Act III, contriving Adam's ruin. The catastrophe occurs, according to classical precedent, off stage, between Acts III and IV. Then Adam and Eve, fallen, are cited for examination and banished from the Garden. Milton has thus preserved the unities and at the same time provided for the introduction of all the preliminary matter. Moses' remark that Adam and Eve are

[14]See Harris Fletcher's index of these citations, *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XIV (1929), pp. 119ff.

invisible to the audience by reason of their sin, which is paralleled by similar dramatic rationalizations in *Comus* and *Samson*, serves, lamely enough, to account for their absence from the scene.

It is, however, much more than a device. Milton means that the audience is incapable of beholding the glorious form of the first, the archetypal man, as Dante beheld him on the top of Purgatory, because the audience itself is in a state of sin.[15] Thus interpreted the statement embodies a doctrine closely interwoven with the poet's whole philosophy and expressive of one of his most passionately held convictions. Milton's youthful thinking, as has often been pointed out, is thoroughly permeated with Renaissance Platonism. In this system, knowledge of God is reserved for the ascetic philosopher who is so perfected by discipline that he can pass beyond appearances and contemplate the divine realities, the ideas or forms, in mystic vision. The passage under consideration illustrates the process by which Milton incorporates these philosophic ideas with the revealed truth of scripture. Its background is apparent in the following characteristic utterance in one of the poet's academic orations. He is discussing the Platonic music of the spheres, a motive which appealed powerfully to his poetic imagination and is employed throughout his early work. This celestial harmony is no less real because it is unheard by men. "The fault is in our deaf ears, which are either unable or unworthy to hear these sweet strains." And it is not or need not be unheard by all. Pythagoras is said to have heard it, "if indeed he was not rather some good spirit and denizen of Heaven, sent down perchance by the gods' behest to instruct mankind in holiness and lead them back to righteousness;

[15]The word "their" may refer grammatically either to Adam and Eve or to the subject of the sentence. It makes no difference. The sin of Adam, transmitted to posterity, blinds the eye of man to perfect goodness. The argument against this interpretation is obvious. If the audience is incapable of seeing the innocent Adam because of sin, how is it capable of seeing Justice, Mercy, Wisdom, Heavenly Love, etc., or of hearing the celestial music of the Evening Star? One might reply that Milton perhaps considered Justice, Heavenly Love, as mere poetic personifications; that the angels have ways of making themselves visible to sinful eyes; that the actual drama begins only with the appearance of Satan and ends with the expulsion from Paradise, the rest being semi-operatic and masquelike pageantry. More probably Milton simply passed over the inconsistency. The content of Moses' speech was an afterthought, a new point not intended to be applied too logically to the already constructed plan. At any rate, I cannot see the plausibility of any other interpretation than the one I have given.

at least, he was assuredly a man endowed with a full meed of virtue, worthy to hold converse with the gods themselves, whose like he was, and to partake of the fellowship of Heaven." "If our own souls were pure, chaste, and white as snow, then indeed our ears would ring and be filled with that exquisite music of the stars in their orbits; then would all things turn back to the Age of Gold, and we ourselves, free from every grief, would pass our lives in a blessed place which even the gods might envy."[16] Obviously the Mosaic prologue, had it been written, would have been strongly coloured by these ideas. Milton has converted the Patriarch into a Platonic philosopher, who having himself enjoyed insight into truth endeavours to lead men to a similar experience. He exhorts to the *sight* of God, explaining that the gross unpurged eye is blind to the heavenly reality represented by Adam and Eve in innocence, as the gross unpurged ear is deaf to the immortal music of the spheres.

Milton was quite capable of thus Platonizing Moses on his own initiative. He had, however, precedent in Christian tradition, not only for the general habit of equating Hebrew and Hellenic ideas, but specifically for the association of Moses and Plato. Clement of Alexandria had written in the first book of the *Stromata*:[17]

> It is said that the scriptures both of the law and of the prophets were translated from the dialect of the Hebrews into the Greek language in the reign of Ptolemy the son of Lagos, or, according to others, of Ptolemy surnamed Philadelphus, by Demetrius Phalereus. . . . And Aristobulus, in his first book addressed to Philometor, writes in these words: "And Plato followed the laws given to us, and had manifestly studied all that is said in them." And before Demetrius there had been translated by another . . . the account of the departure of our countrymen the Hebrews from Egypt, and the fame of all that happened to them, and their taking possession of the land, and the account of the whole code of laws; so that it is perfectly clear that the above-mentioned philosopher [Plato] derived a great deal from this source, for he was very learned, as also Pythagoras, who transferred many things from our books to his own system of doctrines. And Numenius, the Pythagorean philosopher, expressly writes: "For what is Plato, but Moses speaking in Attic Greek?"

The remark of Numenius is given also by Eusebius[18] in the *Prae-*

[16] *Prolusiones Oratoriae*, II, "On the Harmonies of the Spheres;" translated by P. B. Tillyard, in *Milton, Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*, Cambridge, 1937, pp. 64ff.

[17] *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, II, pp. 334-5.

[18] "Ceci est dû à Numenius expliquant à la fois Platon et Moyse; bien plus encore Moyse. C'est donc avec raison qu'on lui attribue le mot qu'il passe pour avoir dit: qu'est-que Platon sinon Moyse parlant la langue Attique?" (*La Préparation Evangelique*, translated by Saint-Brisson, Paris, 1846, II, p. 131).

paratio Evangelorum. Milton knew both works.[19] He introduces the idea of the derivation of Greek from Hebrew wisdom in *Paradise Regained*. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should easily and without sense of incongruity use his favourite Greek philosopher as a commentator on the Pentateuch and equip its inspired author dramatically with ideas derived from the *Republic* and the *Symposium*.

But, as we have already seen, Milton's thought regarding Moses has gone beyond the point of making him a mystical philosopher and seer. He has made him also a supernatural visitant, as he speculated that Pythagoras might have been, a representative of the spiritual world itself. As such he is not merely a Plato speaking Hebrew but a Platonic symbol of reality. Without insisting on the point too far I make bold to call attention to a further biblical text of which Milton could not have been unregardful, Exodus 34. 29-35:

> And it came to pass when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses's hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him. . . . And till Moses had done speaking with them he put a vail on his face. But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with him he took the vail off until he came out . . . and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses's face shone: and Moses put the vail upon his face again, until he went in to speak with him.

Traditional poetic symbolism makes personified Truth wear a veil to hide her shining countenance from the weak eyes of men. Thus Spenser's Una in the first canto of Book I of the *Faerie Queene*:

> A lovely ladie rode him faire beside,
> Upon a lowly asse more' white then snow,
> Yet she much whiter, but the same did hide
> Under a vele that wimpled was full lowe,
> And over all a black stole shee did throwe.[20]

And later:

> From her fair head her fillet she undight
> And layd her stole aside. Her angels face
> As the great eye of Heaven shyned bright,
> And made a sunshine in the shady place.[21]

Milton applies the same imagery to Melancholy in *Il Penseroso*.

[19] See the references in the *Commonplace Book*.

[20] *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*, edited by J. C. Smith and E. De Selincourt, London, 1926, *The Faerie Queene*, I, i, 28-32.

[21] *Ibid.*, I, iii, 32-5.

But hail thou Goddess, sage and holy,
Hail divinest Melancholy,
Whose saintly visage is too bright
To hit the sense of human sight,
And therefore to our weaker view
O'erlaid with black, staid Wisdom's hue.[22]

This is strange company, indeed, for Moses, with the beard and horns, but the mesalliance is no more incongruous than many another which Milton's Hebraizing Hellenism managed to bring about. Christ in *Paradise Lost* goes forth to battle in the chariot of Paternal Deity, with a winged victory standing at his side.

II

It remains to examine more closely the bearing of these speculations on Milton's conception of his function as poet-prophet, and on the imaginative embodiment of his conception in the passages of invocation and personal meditation in his poetry.

A recurrent motive in Milton's reflection rises from his sense of kinship with the great poets of the past. We see this in an early form in his allusion, in the Latin Elegy on his rustication, to the poet Ovid as a fellow exile with himself, and in the reference to Pindar and Euripides in the sonnet written when the assault was intended to the city:

The great Emathian conqueror bid spare
The house of Pindarus.[23]

Later, in *Paradise Lost*, Milton likens his lot to that of the blind Homer and the blind Tiresias. Elsewhere he thinks of himself in connection with Orpheus:

But drive far off the barbarous dissonance
Of Bacchus and his revellers, the race
Of that wild rout that tore the Thracian bard
In Rhodope, where woods and rocks had ears
To rapture, till the savage clamor drowned
Both harp and voice.[24]

It is not their misfortune alone that binds him to his predecessors. Underlying this is the sense of sharing their genius and inspiration, of being one with them in a long succession of poetic greatness. Milton's feeling on this subject is compounded of both humility and pride. He reveres his authors, but he knows that his own art is

[22] *Poems*, "Il Penseroso," ll. 11-16. [23] Sonnet VIII, ll. 10-11.
[24] *Paradise Lost*, VII, 32-8.

descended from the same sources as theirs. The ancients are awe-inspiring, indeed, but his more authentic Christian subject gives him advantage over them.

In thinking of his relationship to old and modern bards and of the heavenly origins of their poetry and his own, Milton must have been helped and influenced by the theories set forth in Plato's dialogue *Ion*, where the chain of inspiration is likened to a series of rings depending from a magnet. "In the same manner the Muse inspires men herself and then by means of these inspired persons the inspiration spreads to others, and holds them in a connected chain." And again: "One poet is suspended from one Muse, another from another. . . . And from these first rings—the poets—are suspended various others which are thus inspired, some by Orpheus, and others by Musaeus, but the majority are possessed by Homer." That Milton had meditated on this apostolic succession of the poets is indicated by his remark to Dryden that Spenser was his original and by Dryden's own elaboration of the idea, which Milton is more likely than not to have suggested to him. "For we poets have our lineal descents and clans as well as other families. Spenser more than once insinuates that the soul of Chaucer was transfused into his body, and that he was begotten by him two hundred years after his decease."

Milton is not, of course, content to think of himself as secondary and derivative, and the philosophy of the *Ion* does not compel him to do so. The great first bards are themselves muses, recipients of an immediate revelation and inspirers of others. For all authentic poets are possessed by the God himself, both directly and indirectly, who, says Plato, "takes away their mind and uses them as his ministers, just as he does soothsayers and godly seers." Milton does not accept all the implications of the *Ion*,[25] but the doctrine fitted well with the necessities of his thought and probably grew more congenial to him after his blindness. It enabled him to think of himself as a poet-prophet and a man of God, and at the same time to look with filial reverence to a tradition founded by the seers and singers of old time. And if he was unable completely to accept any

[25]The sharp distinction between the disciplined intellect of the philosopher and the inspired madness of the bard was contradicted in Milton's thought by the conviction that much studious labour was essential to the making of the poet, and he had been mildly annoyed by Plato's general condescension toward sacred song. See below, note 28.

of the pagans as his spiritual progenitors in inspiration there were the prophets of Israel, who were also bards. Did not Moses himself before his death publish the name of the Lord in song and justify his ways?—"He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he."

We now see why Milton, when he came to adopt the fall of man as the subject of his master work, should have given special thought to the personality and inspiration of Moses. The Hebrew prophet is not merely Milton's authority but, far more truly than Spenser, his original. He might, in Platonic terminology, say that he was possessed by him, as Ion was possessed by Homer, save that Ion was but a rhapsode, echoing and interpreting his poet, while Milton is a true successor animated by an identical afflatus from on high. He accordingly invokes the Heavenly Muse as a symbol of the divine voice which spoke on Sinai, and the Eternal Spirit which still reveals its mysteries to the pure soul of the believer:

> Sing Heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
> Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
> That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed . . .
> And chiefly thou O spirit, that dost prefer
> Before all temples the upright heart and pure
> Instruct me, for thou knowest.[26]

In the other invocations Milton loses sight of Moses and elaborates the Platonic and poetic symbolism of Urania. His insistence on the unconsciousness of the processes of his inspiration is significant. His celestial patroness

> deigns
> Her nightly visitation unimplored,
> And dictates to me slumbering, or inspires
> Easy my unpremeditated verse.[27]

That his utterance is not his own is a guarantee of its genuineness. Does it follow that he would have claimed for his elaboration of scripture an authenticity equal to that of the sacred record itself? Certainly he regarded his imaginings as something more than poetic fancy, but equally certainly he did not accept or wish others to accept their detail as literal, historic fact. We can easily reconstruct the reasoning by which Milton supported or would have supported such an attitude. It is again Platonic. The world of fact is but the

[26]I, 6-8, 17-19. [27]IX, 21-4.

image of a reality incomprehensible to men. The poet's function is to embody truth in symbolic images.[28] Milton is explicit in this idea as applied to the detail of the war in Heaven:

> for how shall I relate
> To human sense the invisible exploits
> Of warring spirits.[29]

It reappears in theological form in the *De Doctrina Christiana*, where Milton declares that God has represented himself in scripture, not as he really is, but in such a manner as may be within the scope of our comprehension, and in such manner as he desires that we should conceive him. This doctrine, the so-called theory of accommodation, was familiar to the Fathers and had been useful to other Platonizing minds than Milton's who wished to reconcile the demands of faith with those of reason. "Moses," says Chrysostom, "was speaking to the rude people, who could comprehend truth only in a material form, whom nevertheless he wished to lead away from idolatry."[30] And the humanist Colet repeats that the inspired author of the Pentateuch "taught the truth and justice of God, as it was brought down to the level of sensible things, and diluted for the ancient Hebrews."

Milton nowhere says, and perhaps did not believe, that the whole Mosaic story of the creation and the fall of man is a divine fiction or that the detail of his own account is of precisely the same order as that of scripture. What he did believe was that both *Paradise Lost* and its biblical original were revelations to human capacity of the truth of God, to be looked on with a deeper reverence than is accorded to the ordinary works of men.

[28]The idea that it is the poet rather than the philosopher who can reveal truth was an early one with Milton. It appears in the Latin verses written at the university, *De Idea Platonica Quomodo Aristoteles Intellexit*, when he ironically makes the unimaginative Aristotelian say that if Plato is to introduce his doctrine of archetypal forms he must call back the poets whom he banished from the Republic, "for you are the greatest fabler of them all." This was Milton's one quarrel with Plato. It is a matter of friendly professional rivalry. In *Paradise Regained* Milton seems to recant through the mouth of Christ, who condemns Plato because he "to fabling fell and smooth conceits." There are plenty of evidences that Milton sought to represent Platonic generalities in the detail of *Paradise Lost*. See Hanford, "Milton and the Art of War" (*Studies in Philology*, XVIII, 1921, pp. 232-66). Adam himself is the archetypal man whom he mentions in *De Idea*.

[29]V, 564-6.

[30]Quoted by Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, part I, qu. LXVII, art. 4.

In following the movement of Milton's ideas on inspiration we have touched what seems to me the centre of his spiritual biography. Made aware in his childhood of the possession of great talents, he grew up under a heavy obligation to fulfil this early promise by some memorable achievement toward the regeneration of mankind. To this end he consecrated himself with religious fervour and to this end he disciplined his life in the spirit of an ascetic. His seriousness and precocity set him apart from others, but his nature craved support. We find him accordingly in adolescence and early manhood clinging to older friends and patrons—Diodati, Young, Gill, Manso —and at the same time peopling his imagination with sustaining presences from the spiritual world. For a time he tried, with all the purposefulness of his nature, to play a part in the political struggles of his age. The failure of his causes and the disappointments of his personal life threw him back on the world of his imagination, which became more satisfying than that in which he painfully lived and moved. His literary, philosophical, and religious studies had given content to his dreams and supplied the material for an elaborate rationalization of his experience, which was indeed already complete and ready for use long before the composition of *Paradise Lost*. He more or less identified himself with the loyal angels of God, with the prophets and evangelists, with Christ himself. He looked back on his great predecessors with filial reverence and affection. Finally, he used the Platonic metaphysics to exalt the true poet to the level of, or indeed above, the philosopher, in a way that Plato himself never would have done. His faith in himself and in his mission grew stronger with exercise. And once embarked on the great biblical poems he felt that he could entrust himself to the current of his imagination, with the conscious and rational assurance that God had spoken to him on the high places, as he had spoken to the holy men of old.

III

It is hardly within the province of this study to ask how far Milton was justified in his persuasion. The question is indeed one which savours more of the seventeenth century than of the present. We remember Oliver Cromwell listening to the testimony of George Foxe and pronouncing "not of God" the light concerning which the Quaker spoke so earnestly. There were then and have been since many readers ready to say of Milton that *his* light was of the Devil.

Such verdicts are alien to our way of thought. But the query persists in a disguised form and has recently received a modern and literary answer. Is *Paradise Lost* a truly intuitional, an inspired poem? Professor Grierson, in his study of Milton and Wordsworth, says not. His thesis is that Milton, beginning with an authentic vision of the regeneration of mankind, suffered shocks and disillusionments which impaired that vision and left him passionate and embittered, grimly contemplating the ruin of his hopes. He was, to be sure, still faithful to the cause and in the great poems he is still fighting the lost battle in his mind. But his utterance is no longer what it was in the days of hope. In proclaiming the freedom and responsibility of man and the loss of that freedom through weakness, the greatest of sins, Milton is accounting for defeat. In showing how liberty was restored

> By one man's firm obedience fully tried
> Through all temptation,

he is limiting regeneration to the individual and postponing the day of New Heavens, New Earth, till the Millennium. In showing, finally, how he who has fallen through weakness may yet recover his lost strength and wreak vengeance on God's enemies, the mighty of the earth, he is resigning such a triumph for himself. In all this Milton is argumentative and didactic, not prophetic. Unlike Wordsworth after the disillusionment of the French Revolution, Milton does not enjoy within himself the experience of a new birth and can no longer proclaim, as he did in *Areopagitica*, the happy and intuitive vision of a regenerated humanity. "His final pronouncement is a conclusion reached by a conscious deduction from his experience, whereas Wordsworth's deepest convictions, whatever their content and worth, were reached intuitively, prophetically."

I confess that I do not find the formula with which Grierson thus dismisses Milton wholly satisfactory. We may recognize the spiritual flaws in his nature, the harshness, the defect of love; we may admit that he can be unpleasantly argumentative and that the motive of justification is sometimes a liability on his art. But we cannot call him, any more than we can call Wordsworth, a purely didactic poet, incapable of speaking immediately, intuitively, out of the unconscious reservoir of his experience. Indeed, that is precisely how he does speak when he is at his best. It is how he speaks in the invocations, the springs of which I have tried to show. It will not do to dismiss these and similar passages as extraneous and inci-

dental. They are the essential Milton and the spirit which dominates them extends the shadow of its wings over his later poetry as a whole. I should have thought that if Sir Herbert Grierson had wished to judge Milton aright he would have based his comparison with Wordsworth primarily on these utterances. In them, at least, Milton is not defending a thesis, but, to use Grierson's own phraseology, "pouring forth in imaginative language and moving rhythms the intuitive images which rise from the unanalysable blend of sense, emotion, and thought." The subject-matter of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* involved the poet in many difficulties, and it is only when he escapes from his self-imposed obligations that he is really himself. *Samson Agonistes* gives him a greater opportunity. It is still didactic in purpose and, as Grierson says, still a justification and a reproach, but Milton's more nearly complete identification of himself with his hero enables him to impress the form of his imagination more perfectly on the whole. The poem is a dramatic embodiment, not of Milton's theology, but of his purest faith. I cannot see that he has lost more than he has gained. Wordsworth may write off his experiences in France and seek new sources of happiness in the scenes and recollections of his childhood. Milton never broke the links that bound his days. He has moved from youth to maturity, from maturity to old age, grappling with reality instead of running from it. He rejoices in being still the same,

> With voice unchanged to hoarse or mute.

The vision which attends him is the sober one of human nature unsubdued though still in need. Like Wordsworth he has recourse to the presences and powers which were with him in his youth. But their half-pagan forms dissolve, or linger as mere shadows of the living God. In *Samson Agonistes*, his best and final word, there is no supernatural Moses, no Urania, no Messiah. The guardian angel is a distant reminiscence. But the emotion which attached itself to these symbols is as ardent as ever, and in dispensing with them in favour of an uncompromising Old Testament monotheism, Milton proves his spiritual and his poetic strength.

LITERARY CRITICISM IN CANADA

PELHAM EDGAR

I

A SURVEY of the field reveals the existence of a considerable volume of literary criticism in this country, but it would be unwise to say that much of it is of outstanding merit. It must also be stated at the outset that even the best of it is for the most part desultory, and confined in its appeal by the circulation limits of the periodical in which it appeared. This applies not only to the casual book review, but to the more considered articles on literary themes, which very rarely, whatever their value, are deemed worthy by author or publisher of preservation in permanent form. Indeed the measure of value attaching to the ordinary critical article is mercenary rather than aesthetic—not how important the utterance intrinsically may be, but what selling vogue it generates for the book-vendor's wares. By this evaluation it will sink lower in the scale than the pulpit pronouncement of a literary parson, and both print and preaching will yield precedence to the vague unmeasured authority of the microphone.

We should be zealous to make this country more book-minded by all legitimate means, and the daily and weekly press can take an increasingly important share in the process. If we consider the space devoted to letters in the papers of other lands, the comparison with our own efforts is disturbing. On reflection we cannot attribute any peculiar altruism to the editors of these great dailies and weeklies. If you read the articles, pray turn your eyes also upon the voluminous accompanying advertisements, and be satisfied that these spacious columns are not financed out of the proprietor's pocket. Not only are the book pages commercially profitable, but a public has been created which would not consent to be deprived of its entertainment.

We are still a long way in Canada from mutual service on this prodigious scale—proprietor, editor, reviewer, publisher, bookseller, and public all satisfied, and the author occasionally content. Yet book pages there are from coast to coast which do useful and often brilliant work. I cannot name them all, and am not sufficiently familiar with many to praise or blame with discrimination.

The Vancouver *Province* must serve to represent the west, the Winnipeg *Tribune* and *Free Press* to represent the centre, while eastern readers find their satisfaction in the weekly pages of the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, *Saturday Night*, and the Montreal *Star*. W. A. Deacon of the *Globe and Mail* is in my view our most competent professional reviewer, but I read with much interest the work of Mrs H. F. Angus, W. T. Allison, Charles Clay, and Morgan Powell in the other papers named, and B. K. Sandwell of *Saturday Night* is his own liveliest reviewer.

Two writers now dead, Thomas B. Roberton and the Hon. Martin Burrell, made journalistic history in the *Free Press* and *Ottawa Journal* over a period of years. Their editors bound them down by no reviewer's rules. Each wrote as his fancy prompted, and there was a touch of genius in their fancy. It was less often of books than round and about them that they wrote, and not being book-learned men their views were refreshingly unpedantic. They have had no successors in our country, but the editor who finds one will have his reward. We have competent book reviewers in Canada, but our wealth in the familiar essay is still to be developed.

Before turning from the subject of journalistic criticism, reference should be made to columns contributed throughout 1892 to the Saturday *Globe* by three Ottawa poets. *At the Mermaid* was the joint production of Archibald Lampman, Duncan Campbell Scott, and William Wilfred Campbell, and it must frankly be said it was not criticism from which literary movements might emerge. Campbell wrote badly and without any literary sense. Lampman wrote well enough, but without much spring or vitality. The only real liveliness was contributed by Scott who possessed by far the most alert and informed mind of the three. He probably ranks his articles among the sins of his young manhood, but he did enter into the spirit of the enterprise, and much of what he said his future biographer will find it well worth while to recover.

II

It is appropriate to consider at this point the contributions which our creative writers have made to criticism. Scott, for example, apart from these articles has done some notable critical work. More particularly would I refer to his two biographical sketches of Lampman with their pertinent and illuminating critical

comment, and to his presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada on the general theme of "Poetry and Progress." In the course of this address he again speaks a timely word for Lampman, who has since that time become the target for the scoffs of the younger generation. I commend this whole paper as one of the finest specimens of criticism our country has produced. It is balanced and it is eloquent, and has the combination of judgment, thought, and beauty out of which masterpieces are made.

Dr Scott's excursions into criticism should go far to convince us that our poets and creative writers at large might be critics of consequence if they thought it worth their while.

Of that generation Sir Charles G. D. Roberts is another poet who has not only relaxed into criticism, but has shown his virtue there. For eight years while professor at King's College he wrote weekly critical articles for the St. John *Progress* on the contemporary output of England, Canada, and the United States. An important paper by him on the "Pastoral Elegy in Greek and English" appeared in the New York *Forum*, and he has written an admirable study of Thoreau as an introduction to an edition of *Walden* published by Crowell.

Dr Stephen Leacock has several critical books to his credit, notably his studies of Dickens, O. Henry, and Mark Twain. These writers compelled his attention by the force of their comic genius. Where he fails to discern in his subject either humour or common sense Leacock's interest in literature wanes. He is too honest to admire without conviction, and since criticism derives its force from a blending of sympathy and antipathy the absence of one of these factors explains why the most trenchant pen in Canada has no share in the shaping of our literary judgments.

Frederick Philip Grove is another writer of established reputation whose criticism merits much more than casual comment. He proclaims himself an amateur, innocent of exact knowledge or wide experience in letters, and we are entitled by his own confession to consider him a critic under protest. Actually in addition to many articles, the majority contributed to this magazine, he has produced one critical book of definite importance. *It Needs To Be Said* is eminently readable, although one would not venture the alternative title *It Needs To Be Read.* It has many of the qualities that we have come to associate with Grove's name. It is vehement and intolerant of course. Even if one dislikes the United States it

is not logical to carry this antipathy to the point of excluding every contemporary American author from one's library. The book's virtue lies in the occasional flashes of insight which the author's other writings have led us to expect. Mr Grove's value as a critic best reveals itself when he is writing in full sympathy with his subject. Such a satisfying example is to be found in his essay on Thomas Hardy in the QUARTERLY of July, 1932.

Coming down the years we find that the majority of our productive writers still do not continue to think criticism worth their while. Morley Callaghan contents himself with the occasional searching article on current fiction, and E. J. Pratt would rather earn ten dollars by hoeing potatoes than twenty by writing a review. His recent article on Canadian poetry in these pages is evidence of his high qualification for the task. The younger generation has produced in A. J. M. Smith a poet of fine quality with an equally fine critical equipment. His output to date is small, and his pronouncements here and there are of doubtful validity; but they are honestly delivered, and he writes so winningly as always to claim our attention even when he cannot command our assent. He and his fellow professor, Collin, are the accredited voices of the new poetic movement in Canada.

III

Let us pass now to the monthly or quarterly publications that have paid serious attention to literary questions here and in the world at large.

The *Literary Garland* which lived from 1838 to 1850 is now a mere historical curiosity. Apart from the fact that it was the medium of publication for Mrs Moody's early work, it holds no literary interest for the present. We can only presume that it fascinated the readers of its own generation. It was the editorial habit to mark with an asterisk articles, stories, and poems that were lifted from other publications, and it must be said that asterisks shine in multitudes in the table of contents. It is obvious enough that Canada in a literary sense was passing through its Dark Age, and the light was slow to break.

The *Queen's Quarterly* has had a longer life than any other magazine of literary standing. It began publication in 1893. Next followed the *University Magazine*, established by Andrew Macphail

in 1907 to replace the old *McGill Quarterly*. Nominally the joint enterprise of three universities, Dalhousie, McGill, and Toronto, it was effectively and ably controlled by Macphail until its lapse in 1920. In that year the *Canadian Forum* came into existence, and though it has experienced various changes of management it still flourishes. The *Forum* considered itself the successor of the earlier *Rebel*, a publication whose title at least gave the authorities some concern. A *University of Toronto Quarterly* existed in 1895-6. The present publication was organized in 1931 with the same title. The *Dalhousie Review* was founded in 1921, and like the *University Magazine* it has had the good fortune of continuous direction by an editor of high distinction. Political, theological, and philosophical by his own habit of mind, Professor Stewart has kept an even balance in the pages of his review, and literature, though not prominent, is never slighted.

I have named all the literary magazines which have enjoyed life and exercised an influence. They all bear much the same character, for none has ventured to devote itself exclusively to literary concerns. The QUARTERLY is genial to the idea of poetry, but unlike the others does not admit verse to its pages. The *Canadian Forum* on the contrary publishes a great deal of poetry, but is quite hostile both in opinion and printed example to poetry of the traditional type. Its policy both political and literary is radical, which may breed enemies, but engenders also enthusiastic partisans. If the magazine were not so intelligently conducted, its extreme liberalism might prove its undoing. As it is our younger writers find it a most stimulating medium, and even its capacity to annoy has its value in the long result.

Remarks on the *University Magazine* may well be prefaced by words from the *Canadian Forum*, which began publication in the year of the demise of the older magazine: "The *University Magazine* has suspended publication this fall. For twenty years—a long period in the annals of Canadian magazines—it has maintained a higher standard of literary and material excellence than—it is safe to say—any of its predecessors."

It was controlled by the method of a wise and kindly dictatorship, but when the dictator decided that his benevolence and his pocket could not be reconciled, the genial experiment came to an end.

The late Sir Andrew Macphail by force of personality and

intellect held a unique position among Canadian writers. He has written memorable books, but keen as was his general interest in letters his mind was not fashioned for literary criticism. As an author, therefore, he does not fall within the scope of this article, but as editor of the *University Magazine* his importance is beyond question. It is no slight thing to have been among the first to recognize an emerging talent, and to possess at the same time the will and the power to give that talent scope for development. Macphail was not only Marjorie Pickthall's first publisher, but he was also her first important friend. He would have liked to be remembered for this.

The UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY was the last of the group to enter the field. It would be invidious to make comparisons as to its relative merits in a literary sense. Contributions of fine quality are well distributed through the other mediums, but we note a growing tendency in the Toronto publication to increase the space devoted to pure literature. And a feature of definite importance has been introduced in the last four years. It was inaugurated in 1936 when fifty-three pages of the April number were set apart for a section called "Letters in Canada: 1935." Seven lists of titles were compiled by Alison Ewart under the headings, *Cultural and Literary History of Canada: Poetry: Fiction: Drama: Miscellaneous Prose: Miscellaneous Collections: Scholarship in the Humanities*. For the sections on Poetry, Fiction, and Drama introductory articles were provided. The article on Poetry was contributed by E. K. Brown, on Fiction by the late E. K. Broadus (since replaced by J. R. MacGillivray), and on Drama by W. S. Milne; A. S. P. Woodhouse, the editor of the whole survey, dealt with the remaining material. The system since then has been materially the same. The mechanism works with more perfection, and a division has now been made between English and French productions with an essay on the latter by Felix Walter, and a note on writings in other languages by Watson Kirkconnell. I can think of no greater service to our literature than this annual stock-taking of our efforts, accompanied as it is by such fair-minded and scholarly comment.

Such reference as has been made to our quarterlies is germane to the theme of this discussion, for the copious list of contributors' names that might be presented would indicate how many of our established critics first announced themselves in their pages.

Criticism cannot grow up in a void, and book-reviewing in the daily press does not provide a satisfactory initiation for those who wish to perform their work in a larger way. We cannot advance in critical power until ideas are both explored and initiated.

These quarterlies, as I have said, do not confine themselves to literary issues. But a publication of this type exists in the *Canadian Bookman*, which at the moment devotes itself chiefly to short-scale reviews of current books. It is to be hoped that capital may be found, or an increased public, to permit expansion in the way that I have indicated and the management desires.

IV

This paper would be more inadequate than it is if a section were not devoted to critical books or articles in the field of scholarship. One difficulty that confronts me is that no individual is competent in these days of specialization to make satisfactory pronouncements on more than a few specimens of the annual output. A second difficulty, and one that offers a cowardly evasion of my problem, is that many of these works of exact scholarship are so eminently readable, so human, and so well written that they naturally fall within the region of *belles-lettres* and could be dealt with in that category. Of such a character is the work of more than one of our scholars in the humanities, who on occasion divest themselves of their gowns to speak in open forum. The salutary results of the practice of exactitude which are revealed in their excursions into general criticism will tend to establish themselves universally, and our critics at large will come to learn that a knowledge of the facts and capacity to generalize from the facts are essential in the approach to any literary problem. We are far as yet from that result, but at least we have the example.

The names and productions of our scholarly writers are listed annually in these pages. Mention is made here only of those with whose work I am familiar. The enumeration includes Archibald MacMechan, James Cappon, H. L. Stewart, Watson Kirkconnell, A. F. B. Clark, Douglas Bush, G. G. Sedgewick, Leon Edel, Felix Walter, H. Steinhauer, E. T. Owen, Gilbert Norwood, and Norman DeWitt. Appraisal is for the most part withheld, but the unique work of Professor Kirkconnell deserves specific reference. Linguistically he is equipped as no one else in the country, and he is our

only bridge of connection with Scandinavian and Slavonic literature. His verse translations from these sources are of themselves a service to scholarship, and his critical approach rests on a sure foundation of knowledge.

Two scholars named in the list, Douglas Bush and G. G. Sedgewick, have recently lectured on the Alexander foundation. Dr Bush's brilliant account of the characteristics of Renaissance and Reformation has still to make its appearance in book form. Professor Sedgewick's investigation *Of Irony, Especially in Drama* is number 10 in the Philology and Literature series of the "University of Toronto Studies." He fortifies his theory and history of the subject by illustrative examples from the Greek tragedians, and concludes with a most penetrating analysis of *Othello* as the supreme manifestation of irony in world literature. Sedgewick's basic contention is that irony is "fundamental in the art of the theatre." The implications of this idea would compel the assumption that without irony there can be no effective drama. It is indeed a bold contention, but it is brilliantly if not altogether convincingly sustained.

Specific mention of books of scholarship may fittingly close with reference to Professor A. F. B. Clark's monumental work, *Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England.* It is a work of extreme erudition, and is Canada's most important contribution in the international field. Mr Clark has not only an enviable range of knowledge; his literary discrimination is equally in evidence, and the combination should produce in his forthcoming *Racine* a work of high significance.

V

My last concern must be with books that are in current circulation. The dilemma above referred to reappears here. As we found so many scholarly books eminently readable, so here we discover that some books designed for the public are in the highest degree scholarly. If we miss the foot-notes and the cross-references, we accept the loss in the serene confidence that these books are amply documented in the authors' minds.

I wish first to pay tribute to a valued friend. The death of E. K. Broadus meant not only the severing of many close personal relationships, but in a larger, though less intimate, sense the loss to Canadian letters of one of its best critical minds. *The Poets*

Laureate in England falls within the range of scholarly books, but it is neither thorny, disputatious, nor dull as books of that class are generally supposed, and sometimes found to be. His *Story of English Literature* was designed for the general reader, and here, in another type of work, our praise is equally unreserved.

When we look over our stock of critical books, we are impressed more by their quality than by their extent. One hard-working Frenchman—shall we say Brunetière, Faguet, or the greater Sainte-Beuve?—would individually bulk larger than our combined national effort. It is fortunately not with extent that we are concerned. The historian of the distant future who writes of our critical achievement will not fill a page with our nineteenth-century contribution. But he will discover on the verge of the twentieth a growing awareness that problems exist which cry out for solution, and he will inevitably link together the development of our critical and creative power. For in the truest sense all the criticism that counts in the world is creative. Be it understood that I am not limiting criticism to the mere appraisal of books, and most particularly I am not limiting Canadian criticism to the appraisal of Canadian books. The important thing is that our country should be set in the main current of the world's thought. Ideas are naturally contagious, but we have in the past immunized ourselves against infection.

Such fruitful contact with movements of thought developing outside of our own boundaries is to be found in President Carleton Stanley's enthusiastic study of *Matthew Arnold*. Another writer who stimulates us from European sources is Professor Barker Fairley. He is not a Canadian by birth, and he does not, so far as I know, write upon Canadian literary subjects. His chosen themes have been an English writer of exceptional but eccentric genius, Charles Doughty, and the German poet Goethe around whom critical thought has played for more than a century. I have no desire to withdraw or modify a statement I once made that his work on Goethe is the finest critical book that has come out of Canada. Goethe's work will be a subject of study centuries hence, and it is a great achievement to have made a permanent contribution to that study. Professor H. Walter's admirable study of Heinrich Heine falls in the same category.

Professor Wilson Knight is also by birth not a Canadian, nor does he write upon Canadian books, but without reservation we are proud to claim him now as one of ourselves as we claim Professor

Fairley. Leave out the professors and the Englishmen, and where are you? as the Aberdonian might have said.

There are two main schools of Shakespearean criticism today, and Wilson Knight is the active leader of one of these as Stoll is of the other. I remember saying to him once that he must greatly miss the English libraries, and I remember also his reply that he did not need them. All that he required was a reputable text, and Shakespeare's, when he was writing of Shakespeare, was the only voice he cared to hear. This does not sound professional. Indeed it seems the very abnegation of scholarship. Still for sheer delight of reading I am of the school of Knight rather than of Stoll, and *The Wheel of Fire* is a book in the long series of his Shakespearean studies to which I often return for the beauty of the writing and its frequent flashes of imaginative insight.*

A reference to two important books on Canadian themes will close this survey. Miss Jane M. Turnbull has given us in *Essential Traits of French-Canadian Poetry* a scholarly and brilliant study of her subject. As a seal to the *bonne entente* it would remain for a writer of French Canada to exhibit a like interest in our English production.

The second book is Professor W. E. Collin's *The White Savannahs*, which because it deals with present-day developments has more importance for us than Cappon's study of Bliss Carman. The book is well informed, well written, and quite legitimately biassed. If you ask for impartial criticism you will not find it here, for Mr Collin holds the view that our poetry was stagnant until Frazer, T. S. Eliot, and other post-War outsiders quickened it into movement. The very title suggests something virginal and untilled. The book is then a partisan utterance, but we must freely admit that the author supports his thesis with great intelligence. He has very promising new material to deal with, and the plan of his book necessitated that his enthusiasm for younger writers should be balanced by a hostility equally enthusiastic to the work of their predecessors. It is to be regretted that Lampman, whose virtues were so quiet that exaggeration of his manner was never a menace, should have been selected as an example of all that is to be shunned in poetry. He is too soft and buttercuppy for the modern mood, which must fortify itself against weakness by more bracing antidotes

*Mr Knight's latest book *The Burning Oracle*, has the subtitle *Studies in Poetry of Action*, and deals with Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Pope, and Byron.

than are to be found in the pharmacopoeia of nature. If he had had a sun myth or a vegetable myth to support him we are given to feel that all might have been well with him. Granted the smaller scale of Mr Collin's operations, his animus against Lampman may be paralleled with the hostility towards Tennyson of the young English poets of thirty years ago.

The treatment of Marjorie Pickthall is much more sympathetic and is the best criticism extant on her work. Indeed this chapter of itself would give Mr Collin high rank among the critics of any country. The chapter on Pratt is still more masterly, and with fewer qualifications set upon the importance of the matter in hand. In ordinary criticism words are a penumbral mist veiling rather than illuminating the original contour. Collin's phrases bite into the tissue of his subject, and we may be certain that to the poet himself the very anatomy of his creative process was revealed. All this was done with an easy range of literary illustration from other sources, with the result that our confidence in the critic's competence was by this time completely established. We had begun his book in some doubt, for we felt that the attack upon Lampman was unnecessarily cruel. In the Pickthall chapter we began to realize that we were in contact with criticism which intensified appreciation by revealing to us aspects of an author's genius that our own hasty if delighted reading had been powerless to discover. The analysis of Pratt's poetry made us so secure in our confidence that we were prepared to follow without prejudice, and even with a nascent enthusiasm, the argument of the later portions of his book, for which his earlier chapters had been a preparation. We may not all yield to this argument, but we are bound to concede that the poets whom we may name the Montreal group have found in Collin their ideal interpreter.

ELIZABETH AND THE APPRENTICESHIP OF PARLIAMENT

GOLDWIN SMITH

"MR. SPEAKER, I find written in a little volume these words: 'Sweet is the name of liberty, but the thing itself has a value beyond all inestimable treasure.' " So, on February 8, 1576, Peter Wentworth of Oxford began his famous speech before the House of Commons. "None is without fault, no not even our noble Queen," declared Wentworth, and the amazed members of the House "out of a reverent regard for Her Majesty's honour" caused Peter Wentworth to be hastened to the Tower, his speech unfinished. It was, indeed, a consequence that he himself had foreseen. "My own fearful conceit did say unto me that this speech would carry me to the place whither I now shall go."[1]

A study of the House of Commons in this period cannot neglect the agitation of Peter Wentworth. Nor can it fail to consider either the petitions of the Commons entreating the Queen to marry or the problem of the oppressive monopolies. When, however, the final comment has been made upon these events, they remain no more than isolated challenges to Tudor statecraft, prophetic of Stuart warfare. The years of the reign of Elizabeth are years of apprenticeship for the House of Commons. Eliot and Pym and Cromwell rose to defend privilege and precedent in an assembly not without understanding and not unprepared. It is the purpose of this study to examine some aspects of the nature and meaning of parliamentary development under the last and greatest of the Tudors.

The greatest Parliamentarian of the reign was the Queen herself. "Sure she did play well her tables," wrote Sir John Harington, "to gain obedience thus without constraint." Elizabeth was well aware of the greatness of her position. She was aware also that the House of Commons "out of a reverent regard" would be unwilling to pursue policies and adopt attitudes "offending the Queen's Majesty very much." If, as happened on occasion, they meddled with matters of state or ventured to discuss the prerogative, Elizabeth "left no doubting whose daughter she was."[2]

[1]Simonds D'Ewes, *Journal of the House of Commons*, p. 243b. Cf. also pp. 236-41, 244, 260, 419, etc.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 547a. Cf. also p. 141b.

When Parliament met in 1563, the Commons gathered in the shadow of a great anxiety. Elizabeth had fallen ill of the smallpox, and a fear swept over England that with the death of Elizabeth the years of Tudor quiet and surety would be ended by a long struggle for a throne to which there were no Tudor heirs. The House of Commons at once presented a petition to the Queen to marry. Around the question a large pamphlet literature arose. John Hales was committed to the Fleet for his boldness in writing.[3] Sir Thomas Smith remarked upon "the great discourse everywhere about the Queen's marriage."[4] "Delay breeds danger," declared Wentworth in his *Pithy Exhortation*. Four times in the reign of Elizabeth the House of Commons entreated the Queen to marry.

To pamphlets and petitions the Queen had one answer: "It is unfitting and unmeet for you to require them that may command . . . or to frame my will to your fantasie."[5] In the Parliament of 1571 the Queen announced to the House her high displeasure with "those audacious, arrogant and presumptuous men who, contrary to their duty and place that they be called unto, . . . are concerned with matters neither pertaining to them, nor within the capacity of their understanding."[6] Yet always reproof was mingled with conciliation. Part of a subsidy might be remitted or monopolies cancelled. Often the Commons were soothed by sentences that made them for the moment forget the reprimand. "I will never . . . conclude anything that shall be prejudicial to the Realm." "Far above all earthly treasures I esteem my people's love."[7] And the Commons, united by a deep affection for the Queen, proceeded "with caution and deliberation, because they desired to give no occasion of distaste to Her Majesty."[8] It was otherwise with her successor, a Scotsman whom they neither loved nor admired.

The interests of the Queen were also served in the House of Commons by an able and devoted group of Councillors. Cardinal

[3]Thomas Wright, *Life and Times of Queen Elizabeth*, I, p. 173. See further, William Cecil to Sir Thomas Cecil, *ibid.*, p. 172; Roger Edwards, *Castra Regia*, p. 36.

[4]Strype, *Life of Sir Thomas Smith*, p. 59.

[5]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 46b. Cf. also pp. 105-8, 119, 124-36; *Spanish Calendar: Elizabeth*, I, 597.

[6]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 46b. See also Wright, *op. cit.*, II, p. 151, the Queen to Sir Edward Stafford: "My mortal foe can in no ways wish me a greater losse than England's hate." [8]*Ibid.*, p. 158a.

Wolsey had first brought a number of the Council into the Commons, and under Elizabeth they were able always to influence and frequently to dictate the policies and attitude of the House.[9] The canny Cecils "sate near the chair," together with Walsingham who thought "the proper position of Parliament was to serve the interests of the Crown." Sir Francis Bacon also had his place, aloof from his generation in all but intrigue. It is not remarkable that many in the House of Commons feared to challenge the will of the Councillors and to bring upon themselves the frown of the Queen. The way to preferment lay in conciliation and submission. When Mr Dalton defended the Bishops against Mr Morrice, Sir Simonds D'Ewes records the observation of the anonymous journalist that "Mr. Dalton remained always very tight in the Parliament House close to the Bishops."[10] Mr Goodier suggested the payment of a subsidy soon after the opening of the Parliament "wherein he showed," remarks D'Ewes, "a great desire he had to win favour."[11]

To the direct intervention of the Queen,[12] and the pervasive influence of the Council in the House and in committees, may be added the importance of the Speaker. His position and prestige assisted further in preventing the growth of an organized opposition to the Crown. The Speaker was always a Council nominee. He was indeed the important "link between the Crown and the House."[13]

[9]H. Elsynge, *Method of Holding Parliaments*, p. 171. Cf. also Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, IV, pp. 73, 88, 89. The Queen "willed the young Heads to take Example of the Antients" (D'Ewes, p. 85a).

[10]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 122; see also Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, p. 474. "A great heap of more grievances in the church were thrown into the Parliament by bills put in by divers persons but were not read, by means, no doubt, of some higher influence" (*ibid.*, pp. 374-5); cf. also *ibid.*, bk. IV, ch. XII; Aikin, *Court of Elizabeth*, II, p. 334; D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8, 161-6, 388, 393-7; Conyers Read, *Sir Francis Walsingham*, III, pp. 412-13; Nares, *Memoirs of Lord Burgley*, II, p. 258.

[11]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 158a.

[12]It was this intervention to which Peter Wentworth objected in 1576. "Two things do great hurt in this place. . . . The one is a rumour which runneth about the House and this it is, take heed what you do, the Queen's Majesty liketh not such a matter, whoever speaketh against it she will be much offended with him. The other: sometimes a message is brought into the House either of commanding or Inhibiting, very injurious to the freedom of speech and consultation; I would to God, Mr. Speaker, that these two were Buried in Hell."

[13]Gargrave (1558-9), D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 16; Williams (1562-3), *ibid.*, p. 63; Onslow (1556), *ibid.*, pp. 96-8, 121; Wray (1571), *ibid.*, pp. 140-1; Bell (1572), *ibid.*, p. 205; Popham (1580), *ibid.*, p. 281; Puckering (1584), *ibid.*, p. 233; Snagg (1588), *ibid.*, p. 428; Yelverton (1597), *ibid.*, p. 549; Crooke (1601), *ibid.*, p. 600.

It was he who recognized those who desired to speak from the floor of the House. He determined the course of business and what subjects were to be discussed. "Wherefore, Mr. Speaker," said the Lord Keeper, "Her Majesty's pleasure is that if you perceive any idle heads who will not stick to hazard their own estates, which will meddle in reforming the Church and transforming the Commonwealth and do exhibit any bills to such purpose, that you do not receive them until they be viewed and considered by those who it is fitter should consider these things."[14]

From these brief suggestions of influence and prerogative in the House of Commons it will be concluded that there was no perceptible increase in the authority of the lower House during the reign of Elizabeth. There was neither increase in authority nor any change in form. The development that occurred was a development in a manner certainly unintended, and perhaps unobserved, by the Queen and her Council. The increase in the competency of the House of Commons during the later years of Elizabeth's reign, and in the reigns of the first Stuarts, was chiefly dependent upon two changes. The first was a distinct growth of self-consciousness, the self-consciousness of a corporate body. The second was an increase of enthusiasm and interest sharpened by experience in parliamentary procedure and practice. There was no idea of constitutional advantage in the movements of the House of Commons during the reign of Elizabeth. And yet heightened interest and increased experience prepared the way for a generation of men who knew not fear of the royal prerogative and were not coerced by the dread of a sovereign's wrath.

The literary, patriotic, and religious ferment that marked the coming of the Renaissance to England was concomitant with an increased interest in political affairs. A new upper middle class had arisen, and its younger members had gained at the universities more than an education in the classics. By association with other students of this upper middle class they had become aware of a feeling of unity and understanding and sympathy. With this class-consciousness fully awakened, young men turned to literature, to religion, and to politics. The sense of unity filtered far beyond the immediate circles of university students and graduates, to become, in this powerful middle class, a significant force in thought and action through-

[14]Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth*, p. 266. Cf. Froude, *History of England*, VIII, p. 458.

out the nation. No longer was attendance at the House of Commons a duty; it became a privilege. Prominent and able men, leading lawyers and leading merchants, were willing to serve for the boroughs without demand or hope for payment. "Many of those borough-towns, who had discontinued their former priviledge, by not sending, did again recontinue it."[15]

The rivalries of the university were carried into the political sphere. Young men of this new and powerful class looked forward to a career in Parliament. At Westminster they felt themselves bound to their fellows by friendship, common experience at the universities, social connections, and the possession of wealth. So it was that this important sense of unity was carried into the House of Commons and the Queen herself was able neither to counteract nor destroy it. Elizabeth might create thirty-one boroughs returning sixty-two members for the purpose of strengthening the power of the Crown and Council.[16] Yet these members, men of the new gentry, were soon to discover that they had more in common than common instructions from the Crown to defend and support its policy.

Many diligent Justices of the Peace took to Westminster their "private and local wisdom."[17] These able Justices, whom Coke so much admired, by association with other representatives in the Commons, repeated the experience of the young gentry at Oxford. Men who had little experience in state questions, whose sole connection with London had been through the medium of occasional letters, sought eagerly the "coyners of news" and the opinions, experiences, and prejudices of the other members of the House of Commons. Often at Westminster there was added to the new sense of unity an unfamiliar desire for power.

Thus the change in the composition of the House of Commons brought a new interest, a deep enthusiasm, and an earnest desire for experience in politics and statecraft.[18] Nor was there any evidence

[15]D'Ewes, *op. cit.* (session of 1562-3), p. 80. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 170.

[16]Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons*, I, pp. 275-7; cf. further Mauvissière's letter (Conyers Read, *op. cit.*, II, p. 28).

[17]Cf. A. H. Hamilton, *Quarter Sessions from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne*, pp. 24-5; Holdsworth, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 181; D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 660-4; Spedding, *Life of Sir Francis Bacon*, VI, p. 304; Strype, *Life of Sir Thomas Smith*, p. 58.

[18]Cf. J. E. Neale in "The Commons' Journal in the Tudor Period" (*Transactions of the Royal Society*, 1920). "It is no accident," writes Neale, "that the stream of manuscript material trickles only at the opening of Elizabeth's reign

that this hunger for experience and this interest in the House had declined at the end of the reign. In 1601 Sir Robert Cecil was "glad to see the Parliament so full, which towards the end used to grow thin."[19] It is also important to note that many members were returned for several Parliaments. In 1566 there were few new representatives, and the House itself was proud to declare that it met as a body with the experience of a session behind it.[20]

The new attitude of self-concern may best be illustrated by a study of the conduct of debate in the House of Commons.[21] In spite of the submission to the Queen there was evident a vigorous parliamentary life and the Queen was frequently forced to stoop to conquer.[22] The members came to the House of Commons anxious and eager to participate in debate, to deliver speeches carefully prepared, and to circulate manuscript copies among their friends. Philip Gawdy writes to his brother, in 1589, that his "seconde speeche in the parlement house is yet to make, it may be as wyse as any that hath yet spoken, yet I am untryed and therefore it hangs in suspense."[23] The larger number of members strove to speak "modestly and wisely and truly," in a manner worthy of themselves and of the approbation of the House.

In the "mature deliberation and long debatements" of the House of Commons we are at once aware of the high level of discussion, of the gravity of demeanour and the consciousness of participation in the great business of shaping the policies of the government of Eng-

---

and gathers breadth and volume as the reign progresses." The increasing interest in the proceedings led members of the House of Commons to record daily events in the House and in 1571 Hooker was able to consider it as a *duty* of the clerk. Evidence of the interest of the clerk is shown in Onslow's remark on Paul Wentworth's motion for a public fast: "The *better* side had the greater number"(D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 283a).

[19]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 675b. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 309b.

[20]*State Papers, Elizabeth*, XI, pp. 20-1.

[21]The development and expansion of the Committee system might also be advanced as illustrative of this anxious and earnest moulding of new elements in the legislative structure. Cf. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 279, 309, 332, etc.

[22]This concern for the Queen and her "tender sex" has been suggested above. "It is disrespectful to seem to force the Queen" (*Spanish Calendar Elizabeth*, I, p. 589). Cf. also the Commons Protestation of 1604 (*Phoenix Britannicus*, p. 118; Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, bk. II, chap. I; Wright, *op. cit.*, II, p. 75; D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 241a).

[23]J. H. Jeayes, *Letters of Philip Gawdy*, p. 45. For the use of Latin and scriptural quotations cf. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-72, etc. See also Strype, *Life of Sir Thomas Smith*, pp. 164, 184-96.

land.[24] Together the Queen and the Councillors commanded and suggested and trained the members in the methods of debate and the procedure of legislation. Before each session the warning of the Queen was presented to the House. "Clearly forbear and as a great enemy to good Council [*sic*], fly from all manner of Contentions, Reasonings and Disputations, and all sophistical, captious and frivolous arguments . . . , utter Enemies to all Concord and Unity, the very marks that you are now to shoot at."[25] The Queen's dislike of "thes felowes" who violated the recognized rules of courtesy and debate were well known to the House. Councillors who sat in the House of Commons were always ready and willing to check those whom they found "fit to be bridled" and the lesson of a rebuke from the lips of a Bacon or a Cecil was not soon forgotten.[26] After Peter Wentworth had violently assailed Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1571, Sir Robert Cecil announced that he desired "the meaning of all men to be shewed in good sort without unseemly words."[27] In a "House of Gravity and Wisdom" the Councillors found no place for "misbecoming manners and unfitting words." "It were now to be wished," declared Sir Francis Hastings, "that in respect of the gravity and honour of this House, when any member thereof shall speak unto a Bill, the residue would forbear to interrupt or trouble him by unnecessary coughing, spitting or the like."[28] In 1601, Sir Robert Cecil calmed the stormy House by assuring the members that their actions were "more fit for a Grammar School than a Court of Parliament," and that gravity and judgment, modesty and discretion, ought never to be abandoned or forgotten.[29]

[24]Cf. *State Papers, Henry VIII*, VII, p. 361; Joseph Redlick, *The Procedure of the House of Commons*, p. 30; Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (Alston ed.), pp. 54-5: "In the disputing a marvellous good order is used in the lower house . . . no reviling or nipping words must be used, for then the House will cry 'it is against the order' . . . so that in such multitude and in such diversity of minds and opinions there is the greatest modesty and temperance of speech that can be used." See further Hooker, *Mountmories*, I, p. 118.

[25]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 12a. Cf. also pp. 99, 284, 310, 421, 460, etc., and the Queen's speech concerning "the froth and volubility of words" (*ibid.*, p. 601b).

[26]Conyers Read, *op. cit.*, II, p. 344.

[27]D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 125a. Cf. also p. 623b.

[28]*Ibid.*, p. 335a; see further pp. 340-1, 449-50.

[29]The Speaker was also important in impressing upon the House the need for decorum. Cf. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 475, 627 (Sir Francis Bacon and the Speaker) 633, 653, 677. "It is the antient rule that every man should speak his conscience, yea though he speak never so absurdly." Cf. also Wright, *op. cit.*, II, p. 243; Nares. *op. cit.*, p. 463.

The desires and instructions of the Queen and Her Council were not without result. "The Commons would never suffer any uncomely speeches."[30] In the reply to the Speaker's petition for freedom of speech the freedom granted was subject always to rules of decorum and courtesy that the House of Commons soon came to respect and defend. At the close of the reign Sir John Eliot was able to remark that "noe where more gravity can be observed . . .; noe courte has more civilitie in itselfe, nor a face of more dignitie towards strangers."[31] He observed also that "the meanest burgess has as much favour as the best knight or counsellor, all sitting in one capacitie of commoners, and in the like relation to their countries."[32]

With the increasing care and courtesy of debate there arose also in the House of Commons new modes of procedure and practice. Such developments were accompanied by a heightened watchfulness to safeguard precedent and privilege through the preparation of Parliamentary Journals. It was fortunate, indeed, for the Journals were to be of high importance under the Stuarts in the consolidation of many of these new or disputed powers.[33]

In the reign of Elizabeth, as has been suggested in another context, the House of Commons was not willing to oppose the Queen. Those who came as representatives to Westminster shared with all England the devotion to her person. So well did Elizabeth understand the temper of the House, so carefully were her speeches phrased, and her policies exhibited, that there never prevailed anything other than confidence between the Crown and the people. Thus it was that Peter Wentworth, though he spoke with the accents of the great Puritan constitutionalists of the next century, found his temper and untamable tongue greeted with amazement rather than understanding and sympathy. With the death of Elizabeth the old idea of the extent and character of the prerogative departed.[34] The

[30]Henry Elsynge, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[31]Forster, *Sir John Eliot*, I, p. 238.

[32]Eliot, *Negotium Posterorum* (Grosart ed.), II, pp. 52-3. The high standard of parliamentary debate may be examined in D'Ewes, pp. 163ff., 494f., 506ff., 645ff., 682ff.

[33]Cf. The discussion of prerogative and precedent in D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-68, 343, 354, 490, 494, 553, 572, 633, 638, 644-9, etc. Cf. also Eliot, *Negotium Posterorum*, p. 84. In the following reign "the esteeme of precedent did remayne, with those that knew the true value of antiquitie."

[34]Cf. G. W. Child, *Church and State under the Tudors*, p. 227; Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*, I, p. 264.

unkingly James Stuart could command neither the affection nor the loyalty of a people accustomed to Elizabeth Tudor.

On the threshold of the Stuart age the House of Commons differed little in debate and procedure from a modern legislative body. The Queen and her Council had educated its members so thoroughly that the House of Commons needed nothing more than the occasion and the necessity to demonstrate its skill, ability, and power.[35] No approach to Stuart constitutional history can be complete without an appreciation of the great changes during this period of apprenticeship, not only in competition but also in the tone and temper of debate. Throughout the reign of Elizabeth the most significant development is the transition of a body of "humours and uproars" to a House of Commons that has since reflected, in calm and unhurried deliberation, the mind and will of the British people.

[35]It may also be remarked that the Queen and Council were alike distressed by the growth of public discussion in matters relating to government. The House of Commons, by the end of the reign, might claim to have been received into the inner circle and to them Sir Robert Cecil declared: "I fear we are not secret amongst ourselves. Then I must needs give you this for a future caution: that whatsoever is subject to a Public Exposition, cannot be Good. . . . I wish, that whatsoever is here spoken may be buried within these walls" (Heywood Townshend, *Historical Collection*, pp. 251-2).

THE ORESTEIA OF AESCHYLUS

E. T. Owen

IN a former paper in the Quarterly (July, 1934) I attempted an explanation of the nature and methods of Aeschylean tragedy. A few typical comments on various plays will show that there is need for some explanation: of the *Seven Against Thebes* it has been said, "The first half of the play is in strictness not dramatic at all—a merely static presentment of the situation;" of the *Agamemnon*, "The drama makes but little progress until it is half over;" of the *Choephoroe*, "The real action does not begin until the play is half over." I submit that no artist habitually begins his artistry in the middle of his piece. These plays, whatever else they were written for, were written to entertain, or at least to hold the attention of, an audience, and therefore it is obvious that they must have had a different sort of interest from that which the critics quoted look for in them, an interest that was engaged and satisfied by whatever it is that is going on before the "real action" begins; in other words, the "real action" is not the artistic action of the play, but only part of it. My explanation was that the Aeschylean plot is to be looked for not in the story as such, but in what the form into which it is cast makes of the story through the implications of its technique and its religious function. Certainly what the Athenian spectators were watching was a drama, but not in the shape in which we see it or try to see it; for although it had now become for them in the main an entertainment, they still watched a choral rite being performed, and the action they saw taking place was of the sort appropriate to such a rite; it was not, for them, a representation of events as they had happened or might have happened. We cannot help thinking of Aeschylus as valiantly trying to write dramas as good as ours, and being hopelessly cramped by the queer form he had to use, and we keep assuring him that he did very well under the circumstances. But he was engaged on something quite different; he aimed at presenting no more than an interpretation of the story, and, while he doubtless believed that this interpretation represented a reality, it was such a reality as could be seen nowhere else and in no other way. For the story was presented under the similitude of a choral rite; entering the orchestra, it took its shape from its environment, which gave it a movement and a meaning over and above its own.

In the *Oresteia* the story of Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra and Orestes is so treated. Agamemnon, in order to win his way to Troy, had been forced to offer his daughter as a sacrifice to the hostile Artemis; in revenge for this act his wife murdered him on his return to Argos; their son, Orestes, when grown to manhood, slew his mother as a necessary act of retributive justice, by the explicit command of Apollo; pursued none the less by the Erinyes, the embodied spirits of retributive justice, he sought refuge in Athens, where his case was heard before a specially constituted tribunal of Athenian citizens, presided over by Athena, and the verdict barely awarded in his favour by the casting vote of the goddess. This story is set forth in three parts, called respectively *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroe*, *Eumenides*. These three parts, it must be understood, are not three plays, but one play, and neither the artistic nor the religious purpose of Aeschylus should be judged (as it generally is) by what is said or done in any one of them by itself. The poet composed the *Agamemnon* with the *Eumenides* in his mind, and he composed the *Eumenides* as the *dénouement* of the action begun in the *Agamemnon*.

In considering what this story becomes in the hands of Aeschylus, it is convenient for my purpose to begin at the end, for the goal of the action helps us to see what the action is, and we need help here because the method is unfamiliar. Some modern dramas end before their story is finished; the *Oresteia* continues after the end of its story. The last quarter of the *Eumenides* is concerned not with Orestes and his fortunes, but with Athens, a city which is only incidentally connected with the story, and we are evidently expected to feel that the trilogy reaches its natural consummation and satisfactory solution in the Erinyes' taking up their abode in Athens and promising to bless and protect her forever. Croiset dismisses this scene, gently, as "a flaw, though not a serious flaw, in the *ensemble* of the trilogy:" Aeschylus in the course of developing his story has created a situation that carries him beyond his original intention, a side issue raised in the enthusiasm of the moment—the fierce threats made by the Erinyes against Athens for supporting Orestes—forces him to end his whole work with the satisfaction of a minor, incidental interest. "The departure of Orestes marks the end of that long chain of events which had had their beginning in the *Agamemnon*. In so far as it is the dramatic development of a legend, the trilogy is finished; the acquittal of the son, the avenger of his

father, is its natural *dénouement*."[1] But there is the point; the story is not the poet's subject; his artistic purpose goes beyond the dramatic development of a legend; that is why his play does not end with the end of the story.

The subject of the *Oresteia* is the creation of a new moral order; Aeschylus depicts the vast chain of events which the death of Agamemnon started in heaven and earth, how it and its results shook the universe to its foundations and altered the spiritual history of the world; he presents the legend as a turning-point in the destinies of mankind. Of course this does not mean that he thought it really came about in this way (almost certainly he treated the same subject in the *Prometheus* trilogy with quite a different setting), but he uses the story to picture what he took to be a fact in man's spiritual progress; nor that he regarded the goal as finally attained, the struggle and pain over forever; his plays represent within themselves the achievement of the prosperity which, following the lines of their artistic origin, they aim at achieving; they record and celebrate a great victory won, the victory of righteousness; they are the triumph-songs of civilization. But he sings them to maintain it, to brace and inspire his people to guard their precious, hard-won heritage, and no doubt believing that, through the power and according to the method of the ancient ritual, by saying so he might help to make it so.

If we remember that to a Greek of this period, living near both in space and time to barbarism, civilization was still something precious and wonderful,[2] we can understand that to symbolize the establishment of a new moral order in the universe by the institution of the Athenian system of trial by jury might be very far from bathos to the Athenian audience. It is probably true, as we are often told, that the controversy, which at this time was disturbing Athens, on the proposals to curtail the functions of the Court of the Areopagus, had an influence in giving the *Eumenides* the shape it has,

[1]Maurice Croiset, *Eschyle*, p. 258.

[2]"Every Greek community is like a garrison of civilization amid wild hordes of barbarians. . . . It is one of the facts that most needs remembering in order to understand the greatness and the flaws of Hellenism, that it was represented everywhere by a handful of men holding an outpost. . . . Greek civilization was never for a long enough time well policed and organized, its remoter villages never thoroughly enough educated, to make it secure, even in its central places, against some sudden blind resurgence of the savage" (Gilbert Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 11).

but I do not think it was the decisive factor. Had there been no such controversy, something of the same kind as appears here would have been required to express the point dramatically: Hellenic civilization, of which Athens is the type and flower, is the expression in the world of human life of the harmony which unites and reconciles the discordant elements of the universe. Aeschylus is depicting man's (and God's) struggle towards the discovery, the creation, of order in the universe, which is attained and expressed by conformity to the highest ideals of Greek civilization. In other words, he is seeking to establish that which his play depicts the establishment of—the rule of righteousness, the foundation of the city of God.

In the first choral ode of the *Agamemnon* the mystery of God's will, the apparent contradiction in it, is plainly and sharply symbolized in the problem presented by the sacrifice of Iphigenia. To carry out the will of heaven Agamemnon must sacrifice his daughter; because he does so, he makes himself guilty in the sight of heaven. There, too, the direction in which the solution is to be looked for is dimly pointed to: "Zeus—to call him so, the Power unknown—in whose name but his can I shake off the crushing sense of vanity? Long ago another was supreme, and is now as if he had never been. Another came, and, overthrown, has passed. But Zeus—who hails him victor shall find his judgment justified; for it is he who has ruled that pain should be the path to wisdom."

This is a dramatic utterance, and not primarily a statement of the poet's faith. I think that Aeschylus both believed it to be true and meant that it was not true yet. At this point it is the expression of the desperate, bewildered hope, the almost defiant faith, of the chorus confronted by an insoluble problem. For, so far as the dramatic action is concerned, the struggle is not over yet; the triumph of Zeus which they here acclaim is to be won through the very thing they are striving to avert—the long agony of guilt and punishment in the House of Atreus.

The action takes place at this level. The drama of the *Agamemnon* does not consist of a number of scenes delayed or interrupted by lengthy outbursts of religious musings by the poet. It is all of a piece; the choral odes are dramatic events, and the episodes occur within, and in relation to, the action to which these events belong. That is, the human incidents are shown as parts of a drama that is revealed, and in a sense created, by the activity of a chorus. There are not two actions going on, one on a high stage and the other on a

low, as is sometimes said.[3] The two modes of presentation work into and interpret each other. They are not even two aspects of the same thing, for the thing is not one of them separately, but both of them together. It is the combination of the two that determines the outcome. The action is continuous and progressive, part succeeding part according to the necessity or probability appropriate to the choral convention.

"The philosophical theme, or the very human question—put it which way you will—with which Aeschylus was dealing in the *Oresteia* was the same as the nominal theme of Plato's *Republic*. What is justice?"[4] That is only partly true, as I shall have occasion to note later on, but it puts us on the right track if we add that the theme is presented not philosophically but dramatically as the spectacle of the creation of justice. It is man challenging the terms God offers him, or, if you like, God forcing man to revise his imperfect conceptions. So far as this matter is concerned, the *Agamemnon* seeks to justify the ways of God to man on the basis of an old, traditional explanation of the calamitous falls of the great and prosperous. (God, apparently, takes his stand thereon, and is beaten back from his position.) The chorus hail the catastrophe that has overtaken Paris and his city as a clear vindication of its truth. Such a man falls because he has deserved to fall. Excessive prosperity has bred in him *hybris*, the mood of insolent confidence in his own luck which makes him feel that the ordinary limitations of mortals are not for him. The spirit of ruin, Ate, that fatal infatuation, descends upon him, and lured by the wiles of Peitho (i.e., Temptation), he commits the rash act that seals and justifies his doom. So the chorus sing triumphantly, assured by its appropriateness that this ancient parable represents aright the way Zeus works; and, as by the power of their song, the events in which they are concerned begin to move in unison with it. The chorus are confronted with another example of the principle they have invoked and are challenged to call it just. Agamemnon goes to his doom to the selfsame tune and words, though this time the words are translated into

[3]E.g., by F. M. Cornford, in his *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, p. 144.

[4]J. C. Lawson, *Agamemnon*, p. xxxiii. See also W. F. J. Knight, "The Tragic Vision of Aeschylus" (*Greece and Rome*, Oct. 1935), a profoundly suggestive study of this topic of justice. Mr. Knight has summed up in one brief sentence the main "lesson" of Aeschylean Tragedy: "Man must create the world in which his dreams are true."

spectacle. The story becomes the visible embodiment of the invisible action they have with religious satisfaction pictured as going on behind the scenes, to control and direct the calamity of Troy. And the spectacular quality of Agamemnon's entrance, with the throngs of attendants crowding upon the stage and the blaze of colour as the crimson carpets are unrolled for the treading of the king, seems designed to mark the transition from ear to eye. The theme becomes, as it were, the scenic background against which the figures move, showing up the significance of their groupings, so that we do not just see Agamemnon succumbing to the blandishments of Clytaemnestra; we see Hybris lured by the wiles of Peitho into the toils of doom. Nor does this mean that Agamemnon is in any sense punished for his presumption in walking upon the sacred purples. The scene is symbolic; it is the lyric theme presented as a spectacle, a tableau; it gathers up, epitomizes, expresses as in a parable the nature of Agamemnon's sin.[5] The doctrine acclaimed by the chorus is confirmed; it comes alive in the event that answers them. And yet it is plain that there is something terribly wrong; for is it not also the triumph of evil? Can Peitho be really a minister of the god of justice? At the sight of Clytaemnestra exulting over her deed, the chorus cannot believe it. This is monstrous and hideous and altogether evil. And yet there *is* the other side, there is justice here; and when she savagely reminds them of Iphigenia, their protests are silenced: "Judgment is baffled. The spoiler is spoiled; he pays again who slew. It abides while Zeus bides on his throne that to him that doeth, it shall be done." The hand of God obviously, and yet as obviously the triumph of evil; justice certainly, but as certainly wickedness. Thus the first development of the subject ends in a harsh and violent discord.

This is a very inadequate account of the *Agamemnon*, but I am concerned with only one aspect of it, how it introduces and sets forth the problem with which the trilogy deals. Regarded as a single piece, it may well be judged chorally, reflectively, overweighted; and in various forms the complaint has been made that the event is hardly big enough to fill the stage prepared in the great

[5]This interpretation of the scene is fully set forth in Walter Headlam's paper, "The Second Chorus of the *Agamemnon*" (*Cambridge Praelections*, 1906). However, I think he overstates the importance of the theme when he says, "It contains the hidden key to the meaning of Aeschylus in the whole of this great play." It matters much more for what it does than for what it says.

odes that lead up to it. But this "vast enigmatic prologue," as Verrall calls the first half of the play, is proportioned to the whole trilogy. It puts before us the immense scene required for the action the poet designs, lifts our eyes to horizons wide enough to contain it, and the drama of Agamemnon's death is, in that reference, as the first episode in the mighty drama set forth in the *Oresteia*, the subject of which is nothing less than the cosmic adjustments which the poet has represented as signified by this series of events.

In the *Choephoroe* Aeschylus makes another attempt to achieve his harmony, building on the same base but leaving out what seemed to be the disturbing motif. The word is still "Blood for blood;" but Orestes' deed is undertaken in the highest spirit of a holy duty; it is sanctioned, commanded, by a god, and that god the recognized official voice of Zeus himself.

The *Choephoroe* has been generally judged disappointing and comparatively flat after the dramatic splendours of the *Agamemnon*. Careless of our praise, unconscious, it would seem, of his own powers, Aeschylus sticks to his subject, and ignores our demands. He constructs this play round the great lyric scene which represents a formal rite of invocation whereby Orestes, Electra, and the chorus of libation-bearers seek to induce the spirit of Agamemnon and all the powers of heaven and hell to assist their work of righteous vengeance. For by doing so he can express his subject in terms of his story; he can keep on the required human plane, and yet draw our eyes beyond it. In such a rite Orestes and Electra naturally and necessarily meet and touch the spirit world where is the true scene of the action. This is the only way he can at this stage depict it; for the story must be told, and his business now is to show Orestes slaying his mother. But it is not the slaying in itself that is of chief dramatic moment, it is the stir and movement in the spirit world which this slaying signifies in its inception and in its results. And it is to this that the ceremonial about Agamemnon's tomb directs the attention. Gilbert Murray partially expresses the point when in comparing this play with the *Electras* of Sophocles and Euripides he says, "The main interest of the other plays is to describe how the woman Electra felt and acted with regard to the murder of her mother and her step-father; in this play it is to narrate how Agamemnon, the long dead, was awakened to help his children to avenge him."[6] Thus this scene, which we are inclined to feel unduly delays

[6] *The Choephoroe*, translated by Gilbert Murray.

the drama, is the centre of it, and the other scenes of the play have their point and bearing in the light of this one. All that precedes it is designed to set the stage for the ritual; the closing scenes show its results.

One point about it is sufficient to illustrate its dramatic purpose as it bears upon the main problem of the trilogy. The chorus begin the rite with these words: "Justice cries, 'Let tongue of hatred answer tongue of hatred; let murderous blow atone for murderous blow.' To him that doeth it shall be done." Such is the justice they are invoking—like for like. It is so far the only conception of justice, and it was, as we have noted, the principle that Clytaemnestra appealed to in defending her crime, and the chorus on that occasion had been forced to acknowledge its validity: "It abides while Zeus bides on his throne that to him that doeth it shall be done." But that was not a clear case; the principle there worked through an obvious wrong; it did not get a fair test. Here there is to be a pure example of it, applied indeed with rigorous severity, but not confounded by evil motives. We shall therefore see if it is an adequate conception of justice. In the name of Zeus, Orestes and Electra call upon the spirits of vengeance to vindicate their justice. They respond; the wheels are set in motion, and the law takes its course. But once invoked, it continues to operate. The rite consummates itself in the next play.

This scene occupies nearly a fifth of the whole play (200 lines out of 1,076), and the remainder, which from our point of view contains all the dramatic action—how Orestes gained entrance to the palace, and the double slaying—is carried through with a swiftness that is almost curt. Modern commentators loyally do their best for Aeschylus by thrusting into prominence the little outbursts of emotion that make Orestes or Electra or Clytaemnestra a person. But these are for him quite incidental, and are introduced only when they subserve his main purpose. The problem is set, not to test the human souls of Orestes and Electra, to reveal their characters, but to probe and explore the soul of the universe. The dramatic interest coincides with the artistic structure; that is, the dramatic action lies in what the structural movement of the whole composition represents.

The scene between Orestes and his mother, before she is taken in to die, has been much praised for its dramatic power, and justly. Its very brevity and curtness add immensely to its effectiveness.

But its purpose is to stress the dreadfulness of the deed, to rest it wholly on Orestes' obedience to the god's command, and to underline it as a perfect example of the Measure for Measure principle. Orestes sums up the point with admirable clarity in the words which close the scene: "You killed whom you should not, so suffer what you should not."

And on the triumphant vindication of that principle the chorus raise the *ololugmos*, the ritual cry which marks the consummation of a successful sacrifice. It is finished; their work as a choir in the solemn rite, which the play has continued to be through their presence, is finished and crowned with success, and they sing now their *Nunc dimittis*. The chorus all through this play have been keeping the balance in our thoughts. They have been sounding steadily the note of justice as we watch the approach and accomplishment of a deed plainly shocking. Remembering, as it were, the injunction of the chorus in the *Agamemnon*, they have diligently kept the cheering strain uppermost through this dark story, and have apparently won through to light and deliverance. The cry for justice has been heard. They are satisfied. God's righteousness is vindicated in the law which Clytaemnestra invoked. The wheel has come full circle, and she is here. For as their song ceases the group within is revealed—Orestes standing over the bodies of Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus. "The tableau," notes Sidgwick, "would be powerfully effective; for the vengeance was so parallel to the crime. In the *Agamemnon* the unfolding scene had displayed Clytaemnestra with her bloody weapon over the bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra; and here the avenger Orestes is in the same place and attitude over the corpses of herself and her paramour."[7]

Orestes proceeds to deliver his justification, and, like streaks of foreboding shooting across his mind, come the brief interrupting comments of the chorus: "Alas, for sorry deeds; by a terrible death wert thou laid low. Woe, woe, and for him who remains woe is flowering." "No mortal life is untouched of pain. Woe, woe, the pain of to-day brings the pain of to-morrow." These comments are not in character, nor meant to be in character. It is a way of externalizing Orestes' state of mind. He is speaking his defence, and these are the cries he hears, not of his conscience (it is deeper and more fundamental than that), it is within him the cry of nature, or perhaps we should say, the pity and protest of the world. And

[7] *Aeschylus Choephoroi*, ed. A. Sidgwick.

therewith terror and madness begin to assail him. He sees swarming towards him the avenging furies of his mother, and, though the chorus assure him it is but his own disordered fancy, he rushes away in a frenzy of fear. The chorus close the play with a cry of doubt and despair: "Ah, when will deliverance be?" The poet's new and promising development of his subject has ended in a still harsher, more violent discord. For Orestes has rested his case on Zeus; can Zeus himself be wrong?

When the final movement opens, we have got right down to the foundations; the invisible world has become visible, not just to the imagination but to the eyes. And what we see is the spiritual world rent in twain. That puzzling contradiction that has been heard again and again was not due to man's imperfect hearing; it reproduced the truth of things. This is more than a human problem. The story of Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra and Orestes is the sign and cause of a vaster struggle, a vaster problem. The ends and purposes of the world are at stake. The acquittal of Orestes the natural *dénouement* of the trilogy? It but brings the issue it has raised to a head.

In the *Eumenides* Aeschylus further illustrates his subject and so reinforces the effect of a solution by combining with his larger, more universal purpose a minor and local one—the reconciliation of two Athenian cults, Olympian and Chthonian, which had nothing to do with each other and belonged to different strata of religious thought. Thus when Apollo and the Erinyes stand face to face with their opposing claims, the Athenian would see in their opposition the issue set forth as a kind of parable that was immediately suggestive to him. It would certainly seem to be a conscious purpose of Aeschylus to subordinate all the cults to the Olympian, but he endeavours also to justify such subordination by reinterpreting the Olympian religion, and his reinterpretation constitutes the action of the trilogy. He depicts not just the triumph of an already acknowledged righteousness, but righteousness in the making; the gods are learning as well as men. And yet there has been sounding throughout as a basic note the assurance that the will of Zeus is moving all to an appointed end, so that we are seeing it all—the evil, the suffering, the conflict—shaping towards the fulfilment of that will. This strange and impressive inconsistency, which is certainly deliberate, should not be overlooked or evaded. The end is, in some mysterious way, present from the beginning in the mind of the

unknown Power whom we reach for imperfectly under the name of Zeus; and at the end we have found him, and Zeus has found himself.

> It is upon the question [says Verrall] whether Justice is or is not absolute and inexorable that the Erinyes are seen to be at variance with the new kind of justice, the kind adapted and necessary for a civic community. . . . The essence of the Erinyes' case is this: the act of Orestes, being upon their view and upon all views a crime, is therefore in their view unpardonable. Right, they maintain, must be absolute and cannot bear exceptions. Of perfect right and eternal justice this, it would seem, should be true. And yet, if we build upon this basis, any scheme of law, any whatever, that can be shaped in human thought and stated in human words, may, by the suitable choice of a hard case, be proved liable to the reproach of Apollo, that it is not impartial, but here exceeding scrupulous and there more indulgent in demand. But yet again, if all is a question of circumstances, votes, and opinions, if any and every act is pardonable upon considerations which cannot be defined, then surely, as the Erinyes say, "Right is a building that falls." This, and no shallower dispute, is the issue raised by the play as a whole and supposed to be in some way determined when the Erinyes make peace with Athena and become patrons of the Areopagus.[8]

That is well and truly said. That issue is raised, that antithesis of principles set forth. But here again I should say that Aeschylus uses this perplexing question to illustrate and crystallize his profounder subject. He is not concerned to solve this particular puzzle, to settle this specific dispute. The *Eumenides* cannot be considered by itself. The problem of justice is not the point at issue, though it points the issue, and is involved in it—the demand of man upon God as expressed in what he has made of himself. The *Oresteia* is "historical" drama, not a philosophical or religious treatise. Aeschylus does not solve these problems, he represents them as solved. He is picturing what has happened in the past, how gods and men came to their present stature. He is presenting mysteries to dignify, uplift, and enlarge man's life, not attempting to explain them. And so, to weigh the arguments put forward in the trial scene as if they contained the poet's reasoned conclusions on these high matters, is absurd. The fact of the trial is indeed vital, the committal of the case to a legally constituted tribunal of men. For thus is depicted the apotheosis of law, of civilization, of the *polis* and ordered life. But in staging a trial, Aeschylus had to fill in the details, to let us hear the pleas and counterpleas; and though it may be disappointing to us that he did not put Apollo's justification of Orestes on a higher plane than he does, we should be able to accept an unfamiliar

[8] *The "Eumenides" of Aeschylus*, ed. A. W. Verrall, p. xix.

artistic tradition sufficiently to see that the poet is here merely representing argument and so feels free to embroider the scene, for the delectation of his audience, with the grace notes of verbal sophistries. Aeschylus is no doubt stating his faith, but he is stating it as a vision; that is, he is putting it primarily before the eyes in concrete symbols, and he uses such symbols as the story he is using supplies or suggests to him. The acquittal of Orestes is one of these symbols, and how it was brought about is the mere picturesque elaboration of a detail. An artistic composition must be developed in accordance with the artistic laws that govern it, and Choral Tragedy must solve its problems, whether religious or dramatic, in its own way. Art makes its points by the way of art, and addresses itself to the imagination. Aeschylus is representing here at the close of the *Eumenides* a harmony at last achieved, and he does so by contriving an artistic harmony. The action draws to its conclusion to the same tune that accompanied the opening incident. The scene of the tempting of Agamemnon is reproduced as Athena unweariedly pleads with the Erinyes to enter the proffered shrine. And again, with a blaze of colour as they don their robes of crimson dye, the theme is translated into spectacle. Through eye and ear the imagination of the spectator apprehends and comprehends the conclusion of the whole matter, as the procession of the Eumenides and their conductors passes on its way, triumphant and rejoicing, chanting the *ololugmos*, the hymn of jubilee which marks the consummation of a successful rite—the *ololugmos* which Clytaemnestra and the Libation Bearers had sung in vain. The victory has been won: peace in heaven, and on earth—Athens.[9]

[9]Of this concluding scene Professor George Thomson notes (*Aeschylus: The Oresteia*, 1938): "By his introduction of the Panathenaic procession the poet has brought his story out of the darkness of remote antiquity into the brilliant light of the Athens of his day. It is as though at the end of the trilogy he invited his audience to rise from their seats and carry on the drama from the point where he has left it." This important edition and commentary was published long after my essay was written and sent to press, so that I have to be content to append this bare reference to it. I may say that in Professor Thomson's introduction justice is done at last to the dynamic quality of Aeschylean tragedy.

KARL MARX, FRIEDRICH ENGELS, AND THE SOUTH SLAVIC PROBLEM IN 1848-9

H. Malcolm Macdonald

RECENT occurrences in Europe, culminating in the partition of Czechoslovakia, have centred men's attention once more on the Bohemian Citadel and its position in the game of power politics. Those who are cognizant of the long-time trend of German imperialism, and of the views set forth in *Mein Kampf*, cannot justly feel any astonishment at the turn of contemporary events. Nor can they regard the Czechoslovakian drama as anything more than the prelude to a potential spear-head drive to the grain fields of the Ukraine and the oil wells of Roumania. It is widely known that German imperialist statesmen were long enchanted by the *fata morgana* of the "push towards the East," but the fact that a similar attraction was felt by the so-called founders of "scientific Socialism" is much less generally recognized. It is, then, to the attitude of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels towards the problem of the future of Central Europe and of the South Slavic peoples that we turn our attention.

To understand the South Slav question at the time when Marx and Engels first came into immediate contact with it, in the revolutionary days of 1848-9, one must recall something of the nature of the Slavic national movement itself. The attitude of Marx and Engels towards the South Slavic problem was conditioned by a curious deviation in the evolution of Slavic nationalism; for in the rise of nationalism amongst the Slavs the accepted thesis of the liberal, nineteenth-century reformers, that democracy and nationalism necessarily go hand in hand, was seemingly disproved.[1] This arose from the fact that the Slavic nationalities were so situated, especially in the Hapsburg monarchy, that they preferred, for purely nationalistic reasons, to align themselves with the forces of the reaction rather than with the contemporary revolutionary, democratic movement. The cause is not far to seek. The three forces contending for mastery in the whirlpool of Austria in 1848-9 were: (i) the Hapsburgs themselves, supported by a bureaucracy and army devoted to the dynastic interests as opposed to the national aspira-

[1]For an interesting discussion of this point, see H. O. Ziegler, *Die Moderne Nation*, Tübingen, 1931.

tions of the minority peoples;[2] (ii) the liberal, revolutionary "German" party, which strove to introduce democratic and constitutional principles into the empire, and which looked towards Germany for its inspiration; and (iii) the Magyar minority in Hungary, which sought to break away from the Hapsburg yoke and set up its own independent nation-state.[3] Between the disruptive forces of pan-Germanism on the left and Magyar nationalism on the right, the Hapsburg dynasty stood as the only force committed to the maintenance of Austrian unification.

It might have been supposed that in this situation the Slavic groups, whose national feelings were just commencing to awaken, would have hailed the victory of the centrifugal forces of the revolution as the means whereby, in the confusion attending the collapse of the autocracy, they might have liberated themselves and formed their own independent political organizations. This probably would have been the case had it not been for the anti-Slavic policies of the Magyar and German groups. The Magyars were determined to rule Hungary in the interests of their own nationality and in defiance of the rights and hopes of the Slavic majority within their boundaries, while the Germans, for their part, were known to regard themselves as the divinely appointed bearers of Western culture to the backward hinterlands.[4] In the choice between supporting the revolutionary but anti-Slavic movement of the Germans and Magyars, and the reactionary but at least un-national policy of the Hapsburgs, the Slavs made the only choice possible if they were to remain loyal to their national ideals: they supported the Vienna government. Under the autocratic rule of the Viennese bureaucracy there was some hope for the granting of a species of national autonomy to the Slavs—a hope which was considerably strengthened by the promises made by the Hapsburgs themselves in their hour of need. On the other hand, under the "democratic" rule of the Germans or Magyars there was no hope at all. There is no more painful truth in the history of nationalism than the fact that newly emancipated peoples, in direct contradiction to the principles on which they themselves have based their claim to freedom, are usually the most ruth-

[2]For an illuminating commentary on the dynastic nature of the Austrian bureaucracy, see F. Engels, *Germany: Revolution and Counter-revolution*, New York, 1933, pp. 34-5.

[3]See C. A. Macartney, *National States and National Minorities*, 1934, chap. III.

[4]See O. Jaszi, *The Dissolution of the Hapsburg Monarchy*, Chicago, 1929.

less suppressors of national minorities living within their newly delineated frontiers. That the Slavs were wrong in relying on the promises made them by the monarchy in 1848-9 does not alter the situation. In any event the alternative contemporary solution of German-Magyar domination could hardly have been more acceptable and probably would have been considerably worse in its ultimate results. The Hapsburgs, on their side, by declining to assume a conciliatory role towards the Slavic national aspirations pursued a policy which was destined to bring their empire tumbling about their ears in 1918.[5]

Viewing the Slavs in 1848-9 as an awakening national group, and placing them in the circumstances outlined above, one is not surprised that as a whole they rallied to the support of the monarchy as against the German and Magyar rebels. The reason for the support given by Slavic troops to the Austrians in the crushing of the Vienna revolt and the Hungarian uprising was not their hatred for liberalism and democracy *per se*, as Marx and Engels thought, but their desire to achieve national expression within the framework of the Hapsburg monarchy.[6] When Marx and Engels were confronted with this situation, they showed themselves incapable of understanding the character and power of the national resurrection which was even then taking place amongst the Slavs. Disregarding it altogether, they chose rather to stigmatize the Slavs as people who were by nature anti-revolutionary and irrevocably committed to the support of those reactionary régimes of Austria and Russia, whose defeat both Marx and Engels considered the *sine qua non* of a successful European revolution.

When, in 1848-9, the Croats, Slavonians, and other Slavic peoples arrayed themselves under the banner of reaction, Marx and Engels were unsparing in their attacks. Ignorant of the real grounds of the Slavs for supporting the dynastic interests of the Hapsburgs, they regarded the pan-Slav movement as one more machination of the Austrian government against the democratic, liberal aspirations of the Germans and Magyars. The Slavs, allegedly too stolid and

[5]An influential group within the Austrian ruling class was conscious of the dangers involved in the official policy of "divide and rule." The Archduke Franz Ferdinand was a leader of the movement for the recognition of the national problem, and his assassination has been attributed to some extent to the connivances of those who opposed his policy. For an able discussion of this point, see S. B. Fay, *The Origins of the World War*, New York, 1928.

[6]See O. Jaszi, *op. cit.*, pp. 90 ff.

stunned to understand the essence of the contemporary struggle, were being deliberately aroused and misled by the agents of Vienna. Nor were Marx and Engels alone in this opinion; for even Kossuth considered Slavic nationalism artificial, a forced and unnatural growth, brought about by the statesmen of the imperial government. Thus a failure to penetrate the veil of appearances, added to a natural German contempt for Slavs as a people, led Marx and Engels violently to attack and condemn the Slavic national movement.[7] On the other hand, they energetically supported the Magyar rebellion, which they looked upon as a truly revolutionary movement, although in point of fact it was both nationalistic and, so far as the Slavic majority in Hungary was concerned, anti-democratic.[8]

The attacks on Slavic nationalism and the Slavic national movement appeared first in the pages of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of 1848-9 and reached their peak in a series of articles directed against Michael Bakunin's *Appeal to the Slavs*. This work by the Russian anarchist was both anti-Hapsburg and anti-German in tone and advocated the breaking up of the monarchy into a series of Slavic national states, which would then unite to form a federation of free Slavic republics. The Slavic national movement was viewed by Bakunin as essentially revolutionary and as the means by which the despotisms of Austria and Russia would meet their doom. Against this thesis Marx and Engels developed their attack along two well-defined lines. The first is founded on a "materialistic" theory as to the character and function of the nation in the modern world. The second is less "scientific" and rests upon a latent German nationalism which crops up in the writings of both Marx and Engels whenever they turn their attention to the problems of Central Europe.

According to the first line of attack, Marx and Engels maintain that there is no hope for the Slavs primarily because they have proved themselves fundamentally counter-revolutionary in thought and deed, and secondly, because the Slavs themselves lack the essen-

[7]The one exception was in favour of the Polish revolutionary movement. For various reasons Marx and Engels were inclined to view the Poles as a "truly revolutionary people."

[8]See articles by Marx and Engels in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* for 1848-9. See also *Aus dem literarischen Nachlass von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels und Ferdinand Lassalle*, Stuttgart, 1902. The Marx-Engels Institute's *Gesamtausgabe* goes only to 1848.

tial economic foundations on which a true nation can be built and hence a valid national movement. The following passage presents the essence of the arguments advanced by the two men in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of 1848-9:

> Thus the Panslavic risings, which everywhere in the German and Hungarian Slavonic territories were the cloak for the restoration to independence of all these numberless petty nations, everywhere clashed with the European revolutionary movements, and the Slavonians, although pretending to fight for liberty, were inevitably (the democratic portion of the Poles excepted) found on the side of despotism and reaction. . . . Traitors to the popular cause, supporters and chief props of the Austrian government's Cabal, they placed themselves in the position of outlaws in the eyes of all revolutionary nations, and although nowhere the mass of the people had a part in the petty squabbles about nationality raised by the Panslavic leaders, for the very reason that they were too ignorant, yet it will never be forgotten that in Prague, a half German town, crowds of Slavonian fanatics cheered and repeated the cry, "Rather the Russian knout than German liberty."[9]

Not only, however, had the Slavs proved themselves to be the "chief instruments of the counter-revolution," but also they had no real claim to nationhood at all. For Marx and Engels the Czechs, Moravians, and Slavonians "had never had a true history," while Bohemia, "since the time of Charles the Great had been chained to Germany." The Czechs, although they had enjoyed a brief period of independence and had founded a "Moravian Empire," were almost immediately subdued and "became a football which for five hundred years was to be kicked back and forth between Germany and Hungary and Poland." After this period Bohemia and Moravia "definitely come under the rule of Germany, and the Slovakian sections become part of Hungary." Now these countries, "which never at any time have existed as 'nations,' make a claim for independence."[10]

Not only have the Slavic peoples failed to achieve the status of independent nations; they lack the potential characteristics of nationality, namely, a common history, past, and language, added to numbers and compactness of territory. Speaking of these deficiencies the founders of modern Socialism continue:

> Furthermore, if the Austrian Slavs constituted a compact mass as do the Poles, Magyars or Italians, were they in a position to create a state of some twelve to twenty millions of people, then their claim would have some merit. But the exact reversal is the case. The Germans and Magyars have driven a wedge between them from the outmost part of the Carpathians to the Black Sea [*sic*]

[9] New York *Daily Tribune*, April 24, 1852.

[10] *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, February 14, 1849.

and have placed a broad zone of some sixty to eighty leagues between the Czechs, Moravians, Slavonians and South Slavs. North of this zone are five and a half million Slavs, south of the zone another five and a half millions separated by a compact mass of ten to eleven million Germans and Magyars who are united by history and necessity.[11]

Nor is there any possibility of these two Slavic groups ever organizing themselves independently into nations. For, as Marx and Engels proceed to explain, not only do internal linguistic differences separate them, but they lack the immediate economic basis for nationhood, namely, a strong and well-developed native *bourgeoisie*. This point is especially emphasized with relation to modern Czechoslovakia:

Take an ordinary linguistic map and note the relative positions of the Czechs and their linguistic neighbors. The Czechs are pressed into Germany like a wedge and are on both sides swallowed up and crowded in by German elements. One-third of Bohemia speaks German and in the same province for every twenty-four Czechs there are seventeen Germans. And it is precisely the Czechs who are supposed to form the nucleus of the future Slavic Empire, for the Moravians are too strongly germanized and the Slavonians are mixed up with both Germans and Magyars and are, moreover, in national respects completely demoralized. And what a Slavic empire it would be in which the German bourgeoisie of the cities would finally rule! The situation is similar for the South Slavs. The Slavonians and the Croatians shut Germany and Hungary off from the Adriatic, while as a matter of fact, Germany and Hungary for geographical reasons cannot allow themselves to be so cut off. According to the phantasm of Bakunin these groups are no barrier at all, but nevertheless they exist and represent for Germany and Hungary a vital question [*Lebensfrage*] in the same manner as the east coast from Danzig to Riga does for Poland.[12]

The position thus assumed by Marx and Engels does not greatly differ from that taken by Hitler and the National Socialist party. Indeed, it is not essentially different from the general tone of German thinking in regard to Central Europe for the past century. It is to be remarked, however, that the arguments advanced so far have been based on the assumption that the Slavs are a backward and, by nature, a reactionary people, and that they lack the essential ingredients for the development of an independent national life, namely numbers, compactness of territory, and economic advancement. In criticizing the Slavic national movement on these grounds, both Marx and Engels were faithful to their fundamental view of modern nationalism as the product of *bourgeois* economic development, and of the nation-state as the highest political achievement of the capitalist system.

[11] *Ibid.* [12] *Ibid.*

Their condemnation of the Slavic national movement, however, is based not merely on "revolutionary" and "scientific" grounds, but also on principles which dangerously approximate those of German nationalism. In the Marx-Engels articles in the New York *Daily Tribune* we see expressed in its full force the instinctive dislike of the German for the Slav, and the contempt with which the authors were inclined to view the Slavic peoples as a whole. The following passage is notable for its emphasis on the importance of "German culture," the worthlessness of Slavonic nationalism, and the assumption that Germany, and Germany alone, must be the tutor and guide of the backward and reactionary "peoples without a history."

> Thus ended for the present and perhaps for ever the attempts of the Slavonians of Germany to recover an independent national existence. Scattered remnants of numerous nations whose national and political vitality had long been extinguished, and who in consequence had been obliged for almost a thousand years to follow in the wake of a mightier nation, their conqueror, . . . these dying nationalities . . . had tried to profit by the universal confusion of 1848 in order to restore their political status quo of A.D. 800. The history of a thousand years ought to have shown them that such a retrogression was impossible, that if all the territory east of the Elbe and Saale had at one time been occupied by kindred Slavonians, this fact merely proved the historical tendency and at the same time physical and intellectual power of the German nation to subdue, absorb and assimilate its ancient eastern neighbors, and this tendency of absorption on the part of the Germans had always been, and still was, one of the mightiest means by which the civilization of Western Europe had been spread in the east of that continent, and that it could only cease whenever the process of germanization had reached the frontier of a large, compact, unbroken nation, capable of independent national life, such as the Hungarians, and in some degree the Poles, and that therefore the natural and inevitable fate of these dying nations was to allow this process of dissolution and absorption by their stronger neighbors to complete itself. . . . How can they [the Pan-Slavic dreamers] expect that history would retrograde a thousand years in order to please a few phthisical bodies of men, who in every part of the territory they occupy are interspaced with and surrounded by Germans, who from time almost immemorial have had for all purposes of civilization no language but German, and who lack the very first conditions of national existence, numbers and compactness of territory?[13]

Speaking more particularly of modern Czechoslovakia, Marx and Engels continue:

> . . . Bohemia was surrounded by thoroughly German countries on three sides out of four. The German element has made great strides on her own territory, even in the capital Prague, the two nationalities are pretty evenly matched and everywhere capital, trade, industrial and mental culture, were in the hands of the

[13]New York *Daily Tribune*, April 24, 1852.

Germans. . . . But as often happens, the dying Tschechian nationality, dying according to every known fact in history for the last four hundred years, made in 1848 a last effort to regain its former vitality—an effort whose failure, independent of all revolutionary considerations, was to prove that Bohemia could only exist henceforth as a portion of Germany, although part of its inhabitants might yet, for some centuries, continue to speak a non-German language.[14]

There is indeed little which separates the policy of the present German government from that outlined by Marx and Engels in 1848. The surprising thing in this situation is the fact that such a programme was advocated by the leaders of a movement whose chief tenets presumably were and are internationalism and anti-imperialism.

Herman Wendel has attempted to explain this seeming paradox by attributing Marx's and Engels's attitude towards the South Slavs to their revolutionary ardour rather than to their national prejudices. On this ground their hostility towards the Slavs is justified in that the latter actually lent strength to the reactionary groups in Austria and Hungary and thus delayed the development of the "inevitable" revolution in Western Europe. In addition Wendel pleads as an extenuating factor the almost abysmal ignorance of Marx and Engels in regard to the cultural development of the Slavs. Briefly summarizing his argument, he says: "In a word, Marxism in its early stages sinned against the Southern Slavs, not because it was nationalistic, but because it was revolutionary."[15]

On the other hand, the Czech Masaryk and the Serb Skerlić have accused Marx and Engels of being inspired by purely imperialistic and nationalistic motives in their attitude towards the Slavic peoples. As a matter of fact much can be said for both these points of view, and the truth probably lies in a combination of both.[16]

Wendel's point of view is especially useful in explaining the basic forces determining Marx's and Engels's constantly changing attitude towards the Poles. This attitude fluctuated from warm support to cold scorn in a ratio directly conditioned by the utility of the Polish insurrections in the advancement of the European revolutionary

[14] *Ibid.*, March 5, 1852.

[15] H. Wendel, "Marxism and the South Slav Question" (*Slavonic Review*, December, 1923). See also his "Magyaren and Südslaven in den Jahren 1848-1849" (*Festgabe zum 70 Geburtstage von K. Kautsky*, Jena, 1924, pp. 315-31).

[16] For a French attack on Marx and Engels as exponents of pan-Germanism and German nationalism, see E. Laskin, *L'Internationale et le pangermanisme*, Paris, 1916. For a defence of Marx and Engels on this point, see J. Longuet, *La politique internationale du marxisme*, Paris, 1918.

movement as a whole. With reference, however, to the Slavic peoples, other than the Poles, although the element of revolutionary tactics is naturally still present, the bitter denunciations of the Slavs which we have quoted above, and their condemnation to the status of vassals to the German overlord, can scarcely be explained on the grounds of revolutionary zeal alone. Marx and Engels had consciously or unconsciously assimilated the tendencies of the developing German nationalism of their times. Although in theory they maintained the principles of internationalism and the non-national nature of the proletarian movement, the theory was conveniently forgotten when the future of the "greater Germany" in the regions of Central Europe was under consideration. The Hegelian spirit of their youth had entered too deeply into their mentality to allow them to rise above the general feeling of superiority which the German then entertained for the Slavs.

It is interesting to note how Marx's and Engels's dream of a unified and expanded Germany has been realized, as never before in modern times, by the present National Socialist party leaders, leaders who condemn the Marxist movement as unpatriotic and un-German, and who forbid the sale of Socialist works within the Third Reich. It is significant also to observe how Marx and Engels themselves, for all their "internationalism," were still capable of adopting what amounted to a purely nationalistic and chauvinistic attitude towards the Slavic problem. Presumably they too were caught by the fatal magnetism of the *Drang nach Osten*, which in 1918 contributed to the collapse of the Second Reich, and which in our own time seems to bid fair to bring about the destruction of the Third. Hitler, like Marx and Engels, has an inherent contempt for the Slavic peoples, and if present indications are to be accepted, feels that a slight show of Nordic force will be sufficient to smash the clay feet of the Russian colossus. Then Central Europe will again be ruled by Germanic wisdom and the "peoples without a history" will be led along the path of German "Kultur." Indeed, "the more things change the more they are the same!"

REVIEWS

POPE AND THE TIDES OF TASTE

A. S. P. Woodhouse

OF the four books to be considered here, one is a general account of Pope's career in poetry by a veteran American scholar and teacher;[1] a second is a much more specialized study of his aims and techniques by a young English critic;[2] the remaining two deal with the eighteenth-century background—the aesthetic background, broadly and practically conceived,[3] and the religio-philosophic.[4] The books admirably supplement one another, and in their divergent purposes and methods they exhibit something of the range and variety of English studies today.

Whatever its origin—it is described as a series of essays—Professor Root's volume suggests in its form a course of university lectures. Much less a handbook than the well-known *Chaucer and His Poetry*, it is recognizably from the same pen, and it is likely to win not less favour from students. Professor Root commences with two admirable chapters, on the canons of poetic art as Pope understood them (the meanings and demands of nature, reason, taste), and on the heroic couplet as of the essence of Pope's art on its technical side; thereafter he settles down to a chronological survey of Pope's achievement, with chapters on the Pastorals, "The Maze of Fancy," the Homer, "The Dunciad of 1729,"[5] "Moralized Song," "The Art of Satire," and "The Dunciad of 1743." Throughout, there is a considered and skilful distribution of weight between information, exposition, and criticism. What the author deems the needful facts are all given; but they are never allowed to become obtrusive or to control the development of a book whose main purpose and method are expository. It follows that the criticism

[1] *The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope*, by Robert Kilburn Root, Princeton University Press, 1938, $2.50.

[2] *On the Poetry of Pope*, by Geoffrey Tillotson, Clarendon Press, 1938, $2.25.

[3] *Tides in English Taste (1619-1800): A Background for the Study of Literature*, by B. Sprague Allen, Harvard University Press, 1937, 2 vols., $8.00 a set.

[4] *Religious Trends in English Poetry*, Vol. I: *1700-40, Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment*, by Hoxie Neale Fairchild, Columbia University Press, 1939, $5.00.

[5] Originally the introduction to his valuable edition of the *Dunciad Variorum*.

(chiefly appreciative) is also subordinated to the exposition and interwoven with it. Professor Root knows that if he can get others to read Pope as he reads him, with understanding, the poet will not lack for admirers. Thus his critical end is served. In a sense it is an old-fashioned method, or at least a conservative—which is simply another way of saying that it has been tried and not found wanting. We should modify it in one respect only: in our view the needful facts embrace rather more of the history of sentiments and opinions. If the method is old-fashioned the conclusions are not. Professor Root recognizes Pope for the "very considerable poet" he is, and says so in no uncertain terms. He completely repudiates the unbelievable straw figure, erected to the greater glory of Wordsworth, to which he (like so many others) must have been solemnly introduced in undergraduate days; and he joins the younger critics in their reaction in favour of the real Pope. But he does not overstate his case—and in this he is perhaps a day's march *ahead* of the vanguard. *The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope* is a first-rate introduction to its subject, a product of mature scholarship, and written with distinction and grace.

It is for readers who have mastered the facts and ideas set forth by Professor Root that Mr Tillotson's *On the Poetry of Pope* will prove most illuminating. He is concerned not at all with expounding the content of Pope's individual works, nor much with the development of his poetic career. He recognizes, of course, the difference between the earlier Pope who wandered in "fancy's maze" (for more years than he cared to admit) and the later who "stooped to truth and moralized his song;" but he does not accord them separate treatment. The gain is a valuable emphasis on the underlying unity of Pope's poetic responses and techniques; the loss, a rather serious obscuring of the poet's evolving thought. To Pope's thought, save on the strictly aesthetic plane, Mr Tillotson pays very little attention; there his treatment is full and suggestive. It is also sufficient for his theme as he conceives it—but is that theme in the fullest sense the poetry of Pope? If poetry transcends its intellectual content, it also transcends technique; but it is independent of neither. Let us, however, examine the book on its own assumptions. Having discarded the more obvious means of organizing his study, Mr Tillotson adopts a device which permits him to concentrate on his special subject to the exclusion of all others: he expounds Pope's ideal of "correctness" as it applies to

subject-matter and the standard of critical judgment (both comprehended under the term *nature*), to design, language, and metrics. It is an extremely skilful piece of organization, and it lays a secure basis for his concluding chapters on the relation of technique to the emotional effects achieved.[6] Mr Tillotson quite frankly writes as a partisan; but he escapes the alternative dangers of unduly depressing the Romantics in order to exalt Pope or of trying to show that Pope himself was a Romantic, born out of time. His sense of Pope's classicism, while less broadly based than Professor Root's, is sufficient for his more exclusively aesthetic study. He can show that on this level it implies no dullness of response and no disastrous limitation of poetic effects. While never forgetting that Pope was an Augustan, and indeed throwing not a little light on the Augustan tradition in poetry (as, for example, in the pages on poetic diction), he claims that by the standards of any age, or rather of all ages, Pope is a great poet. We think that, within the area of his investigation, he has proved his case. Better than this: at point after point he has brought home to us, by careful and sensitive analysis, the true nature of Pope's effects. To borrow a phrase from Coleridge, he has increased our pleasure by making us conscious of the sources of our pleasure.

There is much in Pope's background which lies outside the range of both Professor Root's and Mr Tillotson's studies, outside the range, too, of his latest and best biographer, Professor Sherburn, and of Professor Warren, in his *Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist*, admirable on its first theme, deplorably inadequate on its second. The defect is gradually being supplied by historical works which embrace, but do not centre upon, Pope. Two such books are those by Professor Fairchild and the late Professor Sprague Allen, whose value however is a little impaired by the sort of old-fashioned prejudice that Professor Root and Mr Tillotson are so justly anxious to dispel.

Professor Fairchild, who recks no more of time than Marvell's coy mistress, gives us six hundred pages on *Religious Trends in English Poetry, 1700-1740*, having found the period on the whole rather irreligious! He divides this forty years into two equal parts, and employs in each a rough classification, suggested by the

[6] It is a little surprising to find him commenting (p. 166) on the concluding couplet of the character of Atticus without mention of the very instructive revisions which it underwent.

materials examined: "poets of controversy" (peculiar to part I), "divine poets" (i.e. those who write on scriptural and related themes, and stand in the tradition whose earlier phases Miss Lily Campbell, strangely omitted in the Bibliography, has done so much to illuminate), sentimentalism, etc., etc.; and, having eschewed generalization in the first eleven chapters, he indulges in something like an orgy of it in the twelfth, on "Protestantism and Sentimentalism." In a long and readable preface he takes us into his confidence. He defends the legitimacy and importance of his theme: "For the student of literature . . . the history of what has been said in poetry on an important subject is worth knowing for its own sake. . . . Though literary history and social history are by no means identical, the fact remains that in a general way poetry does reflect the real feelings of the more intelligent and articulate persons of the age. . . ." He has stayed close to his poets and their poetry. Not for him, "the type of literary history which is all background and no literature;" and he adds a fling at the "frigid unreality" of those who forget that "books are written by men and not by abstractions floating about in the air." He has quoted at length. For biography he has relied perforce on the *D.N.B.*, refusing to be led from his subject in quest of new facts. He has "suppressed the desire to draw corroborative material from the prose literature of the eighteenth century." Let no one puzzle over his "rationalizations:" he will tell us, he is an Anglo-Catholic. . . . The legitimacy and importance of the subject we should put even more strongly than Professor Fairchild. There are, broadly speaking, three great sources of our intellectual culture: the classics, natural science, the Christian tradition. In a secular age the last of these is constantly being ignored as a factor in history, or if not ignored, then misrepresented. "Nothing," says Lord David Cecil, "is more baffling to the imagination than the religion of the past." No word that reminds us of its influence or helps us to visualize it aright can possibly be unimportant. But here our certainties cease.

We question the significance of Professor Fairchild's starting-point. We question the wisdom of his distrust of "background." His picture seems to require a setting which it patently lacks. We wonder whether his Anglo-Catholicism accounts for *all* his rationalizations" (hateful term!); we suspect that his resolute turning away from the prose writers of the period did not demand a superhuman

effort. How gladly would we have sacrificed the space devoted to half a score of his bad poets for a little of the light that would have come from the prose of Butler and Berkeley, of the Deists, of Swift, Addison, and Defoe. We should have liked to see Professor Fairchild sketch firmly for us the ecclesiastical traditions inherited by his period, and its main currents of religio-philosophic thought; place his chief authors in relation to these (both the ones fully treated, such as Pope, Thomson, Ken, Blackmore and Watts, and the ones whom his present scheme permits him to slight, such as Swift, Addison, and Defoe); group around them in text and foot-notes his minor figures; and finally establish a far closer connection between generalizations and data than his concluding chapter now achieves. Finally, Professor Fairchild's Anglo-Catholicism has, in our opinion, one disastrous result. It destroys his sense of that complex entity, the Church of England. The sectaries—be they Nonjuror or Puritan—are in themselves relatively easy to understand; perhaps the chief danger is that one should exaggerate their importance. It is the primary tradition in English religion which is difficult and which will yield its secret only to a study informed by a modicum of sympathy. In some ways the despised Pope would have understood historic Anglicanism better than Professor Fairchild; for, though he did not give it formal allegiance, he could write of himself as Catholic and Protestant,

> or both between,
> Like good Erasmus, in an honest mean,
> In moderation placing all my glory. . . .

Something very like this, and neither of the extremes (except in so far as the mean has from time to time reached out to draw them within its orbit), has been the primary tradition in the religious life of England for four hundred years. It is indeed very English—and not least perhaps in its habit of losing battles and winning wars. . . .

We have dwelt at greater length than we intended on points of disagreement with Professor Fairchild. They are matters of opinion. Let them not obscure three facts: the legitimacy and importance of his theme, the learning with which he treats it, the stores of information and illuminating comment which his book contains. Not the least valuable feature is its Bibliography, in which we can suggest only one improvement, the insertion of the date of composition (where known) and of original publication for

all primary sources. We shall look forward to the promised continuation.

Professor Allen's *Tides in English Taste* is indispensable for other features of the background of Pope's work, and it carries the story on so as to afford a background for his reputation as well. The book grew out of "a gradual realization of the extent to which the history of art constitutes a most vivid, enlightening commentary on the history of literature." It selects for treatment architecture and the related arts of design in the garden and interior decoration and furniture. Cutting across the conventional divisions of literary history, the survey commences with the inauguration of Palladianism in England by Inigo Jones (the Banqueting House at Whitehall, 1619) and extends to the dawn of the nineteenth century. Professor Allen leads us into the subject by considering "the waywardness of Elizabethan classicism," in contrast with which the Palladianism of Jones presents itself as a "new vision of order." Then, since in the Palladian scheme the mansion and its surroundings were planned as a single complex whole, he proceeds to "the formal garden in the age of discipline." But before going very far in the next subject, interior decoration and furniture, it is necessary to consider Europe's increasing contact with the East and "the invasion of England by oriental art." It was thus that the classical mansion was penetrated by influences the reverse of classical, and ultimately betrayed from within. But other forces were at work to the same end. The gothic ideal was not so utterly defeated as historians have supposed. Its monuments might be derided by the cultivated like Evelyn and Shaftesbury, and despoiled by the philistines, but they never ceased to make some appeal to eclectic observers like Defoe and his editors, to antiquarians like Wood and Hearne, and to the Catholic-minded like Thomas Gent (cf. Professor Fairchild's treatment of his religion). Walpole did not inaugurate the gothic revival; he merely introduced it to polite society. The first half of the eighteenth century (as students of its literature have been dimly aware) sees a loose working alliance of the oriental, the gothic, the rococo, and that Protean concept, the natural, against the formal grandeur of the classical ideal. The last term, the natural, leads us back to the garden (and momentarily to Pope), where the return to nature in the earlier stages meant merely its adoption as a ground for the superimposition of new and unclassical patterns. And here too another factor emerges, the pervasive presence of the sentimental,

which defies the classical in its inward essence and repeatedly conditions the evolution of the century's art and letters. On these questions we cannot pause here. Nor does Professor Allen, who rather eschews the larger connections of his subject, do more at this point than scratch the surface. In the last third of the century he emphasizes the divergence of architecture and poetry. The mediaeval revival continues to affect them both, but the resurgence of classical influences in the arts finds, in his view, little response in literature—a conclusion which might perhaps be modified by further research. Professor Allen's clear exposition is supplemented, and the interest of the volumes greatly enhanced, by the inclusion of eighty carefully selected plates.

It is the mark of true productive scholarship that it should first of all yield an immediate return in illumination; and, secondly, that it should point a way for future study, either by the material uncovered or the method employed. All four works survive the first test, and two of them come triumphantly through the second. Mr Tillotson has given us a model for the critical examination of a poet's aims and techniques. Professor Allen has blazed a trail through the background of eighteenth-century letters, which constantly invites elaboration and extension. It is sad that he should not have been spared for a time to direct the work in person.

MATTHEW ARNOLD*

HOWARD F. LOWRY

The Alexander Lectures in English, delivered at the University of Toronto in 1938 by the scholarly President of Dalhousie University, perform an estimable service. They will probably secure many new readers for both the poetry and prose of Matthew Arnold; and they will lead students of English literature to reconsider many judgments on Arnold both as a writer and as a man. Mr Stanley gives a cursory critical examination of the entire body of Arnold's work. The necessary pressure of time and space causes some matters to be treated slightly, indeed. The running fire of opinion, however, even when it is most rapid, makes an

*_Matthew Arnold_, by Carleton Stanley, The University of Toronto Press, 1938, $1.50.

interesting game in itself and becomes a stimulating challenge to the reader. It is a valuable procedure, which revivifies an author, particularly when the critic is as cultivated, sensitive and wise as Mr Stanley often shows himself to be.

He says many things that need to be said. Students of Arnold will be grateful for his admirable praise of the still too much neglected Preface of 1853; for his fine and sensitive appreciation of such poems as "Thyrsis," "The Forsaken Merman," and "Obermann Once More;" for the proper emphasis on Arnold's social and political work; and for the repeated demonstration—perhaps the major thesis of these lectures—that Arnold's multifold activities are simply the rich and natural result of a unified life on the grand plan, and not, as they have often been described, the separate and disjointed work of a poet who has abandoned poetry. One rejoices to hear Arnold's writing on Ireland praised as "sheer genius," rich in a human wisdom that is more than transient and contemporary.

The reader may naturally quarrel, as this reviewer does, with some of Mr Stanley's judgments—his tendency to underrate, for example, such poems as "Empedocles on Etna," "Tristram and Iseult," and "Bacchanalia." "St. Brandan" is frail, but it can hardly be dismissed as "a silly poem." However, one does not want better informal criticism than that contained in the general summary of Arnold's work as a poet. And few simpler and wiser things have recently been said than this: "The best commentary on any poem of Matthew Arnold is the rest of Arnold's poetry."

The original subject proposed to Mr Stanley was the Greek influence on English poetry. He giyes us, in passing, some digressions on this subject. Fortunately he elected to confine himself to Arnold. In doing so he still retained ample opportunity to pay enormous tribute to the Greek spirit and to its power upon the writer of the nineteenth century who embodied it at perhaps its best and in its fullest range. Occasionally the present book emphasizes Arnold's Hellenism at the expense of other qualities—his marked Romanticism, for example. But Mr Stanley's steady insistence upon Arnold as a modern Greek is well sustained. In the light of it, he reveals the deeper secrets of both Arnold's work and his life.

In one instance, however, it seems to this reviewer that zeal outruns discretion. There is an interpretation of "The Scholar Gipsy" in terms of the ancient world that seems quite wrong-

headed. It is an interpretation that one hopes will be resisted by critics who wish to preserve "The Scholar Gipsy" as the great and unified poem it is. This is an instance of criticism marred by learning. If Mr Stanley's over-ingenious explanation of the ending of the poem is correct, then Arnold himself is less a poet than Mr Stanley on the whole thinks he is.

The lecturer's treatment, though critical and discriminating, proceeds *con amore* from beginning to end. His own enthusiasm for Arnold passes to the reader, who rises from this book prepared to believe the brave suggestion of Sir Edmund Chambers that "the proportion of work which endures is greater in the case of Matthew Arnold than in that of any of his six greatest contemporaries."

In this reviewer's judgment, Mr Stanley spends far too much of his limited space complaining against "the pert little critics of our day" who do not share his own passion for Arnold. He gives too often the unfortunate air of always contending against something. But this is only the defect of the book's very real qualities. It succeeds in reminding us of those things about Matthew Arnold which cannot be too often repeated—of his inspired intoleration of ugliness in all forms of human life, of his extraordinary intelligence, which was in itself a form of genius, and of doctrines salutary even for our own disordered time. No book on Arnold is a good book unless it is also noble. And this is a noble one.

PHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY*

FRANK ALLEN

Physics is the father of philosophy. Out of the early speculations on physical science by the Greek philosophers, beginning with Thales, philosophy itself arose. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that in that stirring period of intellectual awakening physical science was at first scarcely differentiated from philosophy. It is well to remember that not until about 1870 was the term "physics" generally accepted to replace the older and much more significant expression "natural philosophy." During the middle ages, how-

**On Understanding Physics*, by W. H. Watson [Assistant Professor of Physics, McGill University], Cambridge University Press (Toronto, Macmillan Co. of Canada), 1938, $2.25.

ever, philosophy, which for centuries had been the dominant interest, and physics drifted apart as the former became more speculative and the latter more restricted in scope and more rigid in formulation. During the present century the developments of physics have converged more clearly than ever before upon the fundamental concepts of nature, with a corresponding change in the character of the subject, so that a *rapprochement* of the two great departments of knowledge is evidently in progress. For, as Professor Watson remarks, "the interest of physicists in philosophy and of philosophers in physics is greater than at any time in the last two hundred years."

The reviewer found it a little difficult at first to orient himself in Dr Watson's argument, but once his standpoint was attained the discussions began to fall naturally in order. For philosophy in Dr Watson's book is not the traditional philosophy of the philosophers, which generally deals with subjects of little interest to physicists, and for which Dr Watson has perhaps a rather scanty respect. But the philosophy which he trenchantly urges upon physicists is philosophy in Wittgenstein's sense, "that activity which is one of the heirs of what was once called philosophy," or more definitely a symbolic logic. By becoming clear about the nature of symbolism in general, Dr Watson correctly argues, physicists will become more clear about physics, which itself abounds in symbolism.

"To interest physicists in Wittgenstein's philosophy and to show its value for clarifying physics—especially mechanics which is the logical backbone of the subject," Dr Watson develops his argument in six brief chapters. Systematically he proceeds from Discipline in Philosophy, through Logic and Psychology and Physics, Methods of Representation, the Nature of Mechanism, the Logic of Substance and Motion, finally to Some Aspects of the Symbolism of Mechanics and Electricity.

The distinction between the methods of philosophy and physics is sharply drawn. In physics the problems are solved by discovering facts, and these are not ascertainable by philosophical reflection or by mere criticism. In constructing a theory of physics or a system of the world, one has to remember the apparent isolation of phenomena, or, in Dr Watson's luminous phrase, "the atomic nature of facts." It is just as impossible to form a logical system of the world by a "fortuitous concourse" of facts as it is to build a crystal

by a "fortuitous concourse of atoms." Facts must be combined into a theory not by forcing them together but by perceiving their nature and relationship. Philosophy can and should be used to clarify the fundamental ideas of physics and show their obscurity or contradiction to one another. But while philosophy can reveal the logical perfection of a system of nature it is powerless to determine its truth or error. The atomic theory of the nineteenth century, when atoms were regarded as indivisible, was philosophically perfect and no one questioned it. But when the electron was discovered and the atom revealed as a complex structure, the earlier theory at once passed into oblivion. Philosophy, as Dr Watson points out, cannot give authority to any scientific theory. Its authority is that of "clear statement as opposed to muddled statement, of the clear thought as opposed to the intellectual puzzle. But a clear picture of the world may be incorrect." No more conclusive illustration of this statement could be adduced than the Ptolemaic cosmogony, which, though logically impregnable in its day, was erroneous in every detail.

Theories in science labour under the unavoidable embarrassment of being formulated after the facts which they are supposed to explain have been discovered. This procedure results in the words used to describe one set of facts differing greatly in meaning from those which portray another opposing but related set of facts. The theory comprising the phenomena must therefore reconcile both modes of expression. The most striking example of this philosophical difficulty, which Dr Watson selects for discussion, is the electron. This essential entity of modern physics was first developed as a particle and afterwards, to evade unsurmountable difficulties, as a wave or wave-packet. A logical theory of the electron has thus to combine the dynamics of a particle with the theory of wave-optics. The two sets of ideas are apparently irreconcilable. Its properties as a particle contradict those due to wave motion. As neither can be ignored, the difficulty is adroitly circumvented by devising a "principle of complementarity" which permits either view to be adopted as necessity requires. This artifice is unsatisfactory. But while philosophy reveals the contradiction involved, its ultimate solution must come through physics.

Another philosophical difficulty in modern physics, which Dr Watson admirably discusses, is Heisenberg's "uncertainty prin-

ciple," according to which an electron cannot simultaneously have both position and velocity. Since uncertainty prevails, the theory has been held to disprove the philosophical principle of determinism and thus to give a scientific basis for the doctrine of the freedom of the will. Dr Watson dissents from this conclusion and shows, what is generally overlooked, that the new physics has merely substituted the causality of quantum mechanics for that of classical mechanics, each of which is valid in its own field. The resolution of the difficulties attendant upon determinism and free-will cannot therefore be found in modern physics.

Dr Watson discusses or alludes to over two hundred physical principles, facts or philosophical ideas, some of which are very abstruse, so that his book, even though brief, possesses a wealth of material. It is not always easy reading, and it seldom evades a difficulty. Able and often brilliant it measurably accomplishes its purpose, which is the understanding of physics, and that is the nature of the physical world.

THE TWO-HANDED ENGINE*

A. E. Barker

"This," remarked Sir Edward Dering in the Commons in 1641, "hath been a very accusative age." The student of the first half of the seventeenth century in England is apt to agree, especially if he has striven, with Professors Allen and Haller, to cut his way through the thickets of pamphlet controversy to some foothold on the vantage-ground of enduring principles. The prospect is likely to be at once as inspiring and as disheartening as the vision presented to the wondering gaze of the Miltonic Adam. Professor Haller perceives that the throes and pangs which accompanied the rise (and the decay) of Puritanism marked the birth of a new social order in England as well as in America; Professor Allen observes that passionate accusation and muddled assertion led to a futile civil war which ended in 1660 with a settlement seen to be inevitable

**English Political Thought, 1603-1660;* volume I, *1603-1644*, by J. W. Allen, Methuen, 1938, $7.50.

The Rise of Puritanism; or, the Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643, by William Haller, Columbia University Press, 1938, $4.50.

by cooler heads in 1642. One scholar is impressed by the enthusiasm of the Puritans, and especially of Milton, for the establishment of the New Jerusalem; the other, by the fanatical incompetence which wrecked the Tudor state and begot anarchy.

In the first volume of his analysis of English political thought from 1603 to 1660, Professor Allen deals with the period from the accession of James to the opening stage of the Civil War. He offers a new and, in many respects, illuminating interpretation of royalist and parliamentary opinion; a discussion of the ecclesiastical question so far as, in his opinion, it was related to the political problem; a lucid, though not altogether decisive, attempt to give more definite meaning to the term Puritanism; and a review of the factors making for toleration. The historian of political thought in the sixteenth century brings to the task an equipment which gives authority to his judgments and a colouring to his interpretation. He perceives that however admirable enthusiasm for a cause may be, it is no substitute for thought. His sense of the prejudice, misconception, and confusion of opinion, on both sides, leads him to examine with a circumspectly critical eye the documents through which the disputants appealed to public opinion, and to define with admirable clarity the practical issues involved in the conflict though only obscurely apprehended by the antagonists.

Professor Allen's exposition of the political problem and his analysis of the royalist case are excellent. He is concerned chiefly to lay the threatening spectre of divine right raised by the liberal historians of the last century. Through the evidence afforded by specific cases and judgments as well as political pamphlets, he shows that (like Popish machinations) the bogey assumed much larger proportions in the imaginations of the parliamentarians than in the theory of the royalists, even of those bishops mistakenly supposed to have considered the king's right more divine than their own. It seems to Professor Allen that the royalist claim was based ultimately upon Tudor precedent and upon a theory of government for which there was ample support in law and in history. His tracing of this claim from the somewhat inconsistent assertions of James to the statements of the chief royalist pamphleteers of the 1640's affords a valuable corrective to the simple parliamentary view which is more frequently adopted.

Professor Allen's sympathetic though critical analysis of royalist opinion is unfortunately not balanced by an equally sympathetic

analysis of the parliamentary case. His careful examination of parliamentary assertions from the *Apology* of 1604 to the pamphlets of Henry Parker is tinged with a scepticism refreshing after the uncritical enthusiasm of historians who mistake muddle for prophecy; but his suspicion of appeals to unrecorded contracts, to indefinable first institutions, to unwritten fundamental laws of nature and society, seems to prevent him from giving what one would have valued from so scholarly a pen, a completer account of the theory of society which the parliamentary apologists were fumblingly providing for their yet more revolutionary successors. Their appeals were certainly vague and ambiguous; but if they had little foundation in law or in history, they derived immense power from their intimate connection with Puritan ideology.

Professor Allen rightly points out that the Civil War began on a constitutional, not a religious question, and he emphasizes the fact that from the outset the point of view of the Houses was distinctly Erastian. Erastianism was compatible with irreligion; but Selden and Marten were exceptional, not representative, and it is possible to believe that the religious convictions of the members were more serious, though no less confused, than Professor Allen indicates. He finds it incredible that Milton "can ever really have believed in the childish theology which furnished the dramatic element of *Paradise Lost*." This ignoring of what Milton referred to as his "best and richest possession"—his treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*—suggests the chief limitation of Professor Allen's study. Theology provided Milton with a method of formulating his view of the situation in which human nature appeared to find itself. Hobbes was not alone in believing that "the true and perspicuous explication of the elements of laws natural and politic . . . dependeth upon the knowledge of what is human nature;" and it is of considerable importance in the study of political thought in the seventeenth century to recognize that the most vital theory of human nature, a theory capable of begetting a revolutionary view of society, was being expressed in theological terms. It is perhaps too much to invite the historian of political thought to enter the labyrinth of theological speculation; but such speculation (as has recently been very fully demonstrated) provided the seventeenth century, if not with a political philosophy, at least with vigorous political ideas.

One feels that Professor Allen would have had yet more valuable

opinions to offer had he been willing to pursue his attempt more clearly to define Puritanism beyond the limit he has set himself. This is perhaps to ask for the book which, as he very properly reminds us, he is not at this time writing. In his chapters on Puritanism he undertakes a task which every student of the seventeenth century desires to see performed but few have the courage to undertake; and though one may not entirely agree with his conclusions, it is impossible to read his sensitive discussion of the bibliolatry, the sabbatarianism, and the peculiar morality of the Puritans, and of Prynne, Baxter, and Rutherford as variously representative figures, without being illuminated as to one's own interpretation of this much-used and seldom-defined word. It is a little difficult to see why Professor Allen's understanding of Puritanism excludes from that category the Vane of *The Retired Man's Meditations;* and one may feel that, though he is right in refusing to use the word loosely, the influence of Puritanism on those who are improperly called Puritans is a subject which at this point might have been given more space; but his exposition of the Puritan temper in terms of scripture and the fear of hell is both suggestive and precise.

Professor Haller's detailed and elaborately documented volume is exclusively concerned with the development of Puritanism as a revolutionary force between the expulsion of Cartwright from Cambridge and the calling of the Westminster Assembly. It is the product of extensive research and contains an impressive and valuable bibliography.

The first part of the study provides an account of the early Puritan preachers. Professor Haller determines "to neglect the divinity lectures" and the more abstrusely theological and controversial works of the early Puritans "and fasten attention upon the sermons and other works of edification which the preachers produced for the illumination of the multitude." He is not uninterested in Puritan thought: part of a chapter is devoted to the significance of its essential doctrines; but he is concerned to describe "not what their doctrine was but what it meant and did." It seems to him that the practical teaching of William Perkins, Thomas Draxe, John Downame, and their followers, had a profound effect upon the imaginations of those who had reason to be discontented with the ecclesiastical and political situation under the Stuarts. Though the Puritans were prevented from putting into effect their

desired reform of the church, their mouths were not stopped; from their pulpits they sowed the wind which produced the events of the 1640's.

Professor Haller takes note of the divisions among the Puritans, but it seems to him that these were "in the long run not so significant as the qualities of character, of mind, and of imagination, which kept them all alike Puritans." Of these aspects of Puritanism his discussion is very full; though a more generalized summary of his interpretation would have been helpful, and a more detailed examination of Puritan thought might have disposed of some still outstanding questions.

What chiefly impresses Professor Haller is the manner in which the Puritan preachers enabled the multitude to become articulate. He examines at length the content and especially the literary technique of their sermons. The biographical sketches of the preachers who provide his examples are a valuable source of information. More important is his discussion of their characteristic style, "the plain but effectual way of preaching" which they themselves contrasted with the manner of their Anglican brethren; of the use, by men like John Dod and his disciples, of "lightsome similitudes" drawn not only from scripture but from common experience; and of the evolution of the Puritan epic of a spiritual "wayfaring and warfaring." It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the sermon in the development of seventeenth-century prose. In "making their language stoop to the meanest capacity" the Puritans undoubtedly did much to prepare for the outburst of writing which made it seem in 1644 that "all the Lord's people" (and many others) had "become prophets." The preaching of the Anglican divines has before now received considerable attention; no one has examined with Professor Haller's thoroughness the literary tradition of the Puritan pulpit, though one may hesitate to believe with him that it was as important for Milton as for Bunyan and Defoe.

In the second half of his volume, Professor Haller considers the opening years of the revolution in more detail than was possible in the introduction to his *Tracts on Liberty*. He discusses the transference of the energy, released by the Puritan preachers, from spiritual matters to practical political and ecclesiastical problems, and indicates the manner in which the theological individualism of the Puritan spiritual experience helped to produce an individualism

of another sort, nourished by the democratic tendency of congregational church-government. One regrets that his desire to avoid the complexities of Puritan thought prevents him from offering a more extensive analysis of the ideas through which this transference was effected.

Professor Haller presents a vivid account of the activities of Prynne, Burton, Bastwick, and other Puritan pamphleteers. He discusses in detail the early career of Lilburne, who seems to him "the embodiment of that eagerness for emotional experience and expression which Puritanism had inspired in the people." The place of honour is reserved for Milton, who exemplifies the same effects in a slightly different way. Professor Haller finds the source of Milton's ideal for the church and the ministry in the example provided by the earlier Puritan preachers, among whom Milton might himself have taken a place had conditions been otherwise. The terms in which they thought of their mission are the terms in which he thought of his career as a teacher and poet. The examination of his early writings and his anti-episcopal pamphlets throws into relief the effects of Puritanism upon his mind; but there is much in Milton's early career, indeed much in his controversial prose, that one hesitates to ascribe to the influence of Puritanism, unless that term is to be given a sense so loose as to be indefinable.

Professor Haller has examined with scholarly understanding the enthusiasm of the Puritans for a spiritual Utopia. His sympathetic appreciation of their idealism leaves him little to say in favour of the Stuarts, of Laud and his bishops, even of those moderate rationalists whom he regards as somewhat ineffectual angels. In his eyes Bishop Hall, the opponent of Milton, was a successful climber, distinguished by "choleric righteousness," muddled ideas, and superficial thinking, the personification of "stand-pattism in practical affairs." This is the prelate described by Professor Allen as "an active and versatile man, well-known as a peace-loving controversialist," whose "moderation and reasonableness contrasted strongly with the tone of the attacks made upon him." The contrast suggests the benefit to be derived from reading together these two important contributions to the study of the seventeenth century.

LETTERS IN CANADA: 1938

Edited by A. S. P. Woodhouse

PART II: FRENCH-CANADIAN AND NEW-CANADIAN LETTERS

V. FRENCH-CANADIAN LETTERS — Felix Walter

Though in quantity the output of French-Canadian published works has been imposing, it would be misleading to pretend that 1938 was a year of great distinction in respect of quality. To be quite honest—and perhaps a trifle cold-blooded—if the mass of books and pamphlets listed in the bibliography could be boiled down and the dross poured off there would remain a semi-precious deposit of two good novels, as many collections of essays on contemporary topics, a work on French-Canadian history, several readable biographies, and an amusing account of life among the Indians. That may sound very little, but every year cannot be a banner year, and English Canadians, who are twice as numerous as their French-speaking compatriots, can hardly claim that they themselves have done much better.

Certain general features of the year's production may be worth mentioning. In the first place, the spate of violent rhetoric which poured from the extreme separatists has now dwindled to a trickle. This diminution seems to be linked, and not wholly by accident, to a very distinct cooling of the former enthusiasm of many French-Canadian publicists for the economic and political doctrines of Messrs Hitler and Mussolini. Less has been written on Laurentia the Corporate State. And though French-Canadian nationalism, in the autonomist rather than the separatist sense of the term, is as vocal as ever, there is a marked tendency to consider English-Canadian opinion and to quote extensively and fairly from the articles and speeches of public men living west of the Ottawa and east of the Baie de Chaleurs.

Secondly, an unusually large number of the better French-Canadian books were last year published in France, and French critics at the same time devoted more attention to French-Canadian literature than in any previous year. This must prove a vital

factor in the evolution of French-Canadian letters. In an interesting survey, published in the *Nouvelles littéraires* of Paris (December 31, 1938), Ringuet, alias Dr Philippe Panneton, the author of the best and most successful French-Canadian novel of the year, points out that whereas a popular work in Norway may sell a hundred thousand copies, a French-Canadian best-seller does not exceed five thousand, though Norway and French Canada are approximately equal in population. Obviously if French Canadians are to make a living as writers, outside the field of journalism, they must have access to the literary market of France. To conquer this market means arduous competition, an emergence from the comfortable shadow of the village-steeple and the village-pump, and rigorous self-criticism. The younger French-Canadian writers seem to be waking up to this situation. In "La France peut-elle s'intéresser à notre littérature?" (*Le Mauricien*, January, 1938), Clément Marchand writes: "Pourvu qu'on n'ait pas trop les poussières du chauvinisme dans le nez et qu'on veuille s'ouvrir les yeux, on finit par comprendre que le Québec doit son étonnante stérilité littéraire à une certaine mentalité de douce suffisance. . . ."

French-Canadian poetry showed a distinct falling-off in 1938, and that is the third general observation that must be made. For some time past the critics could count on reading at least one important volume of French-Canadian poetry every twelve months, but today some of the best French-Canadian poets seem to be tied up with broadcasting contracts, and the Muse can only fight a losing battle with Radio-Canada.

Of the two volumes of verse which did appear both are promising without being in any sense significant. Jean Dollens, the author of *Nostalgies*, is a young Sherbrooke poet, whose collection appears with a foreword by that distinguished poet of the Eastern Townships, Alfred DesRochers. One poem, "L'Ile des remords," is a fair sample of M. Dollens' pleasing competence and of the derivative nature of his verse; in this case the spiritual ancestors seem to be Baudelaire, Rimbaud, and the Nelligan of *Le Vaisseau d'or:*

> Mon coeur est un esquif sans voile et sans cordage
> Perdu sur l'océan brumeux des passions,
> Ballotté par des flots de rivage en rivage
> En traînant le fardeau des désillusions.
>
> Vers l'horizon lointain des constellations,
> L'ivre bateau s'élance au pays du mirage

Pour jeter l'ancre au port des expiations
Qui l'attendent en rade après chaque voyage.

Portant sa cargaison de regrets et d'adieux,
Le vaisseau glisse vers les quais silencieux
En berçant sa détresse au bleu reflet des astres. . . .

Le navire englouti par les souvenirs morts
A sombré dans la vague obscure des désastres
En venant se briser sur l'Ile des Remords.

Mlle Jeannine Lavallée, well-known as an accomplished *diseuse*, appears with a volume called *Vice Versa*, which contains interesting illustrations by René Chicoine. Neither her nature poems nor those which treat of patriotic subjects are as effective as the passages in which she allows herself to become critical, as in "Mont-Royal," an indictment of the steel contraption which disfigures the summit of the mountain at Montreal:

Quel est donc cet amas de fer, cette structure
Pesante, lourde, ayant la forme d'une croix
Que l'on dirait, lorsque la nuit met sa parure,
Une illumination indigne de la foi?

La masse, à mon avis, a tout le caractère
De la publicité qu'on fait au cinéma. . . .

It is the novel this year which takes precedence over poetry, and two important contributions to this *genre* deserve detailed appreciation. The first of these is Ringuet's *30 arpents*, and the history of its publication is instructive. The author, a Montreal eye specialist, had written nothing previously and tried in vain to find a publisher in Canada for this first novel. The book was finally brought to the attention of Flammarion's in Paris, who launched it in the last weeks of 1938. Already its French sales have reached the eleventh thousand and it is being translated into English, German, Spanish, and Dutch. There must be some strong expletives used behind closed doors in certain publishers' offices in Montreal and Quebec! The main tendency of this unusual novel of French-Canadian farm-life can best be summed up in two sentences from the author's critical survey in the *Nouvelles littéraires*. Speaking of a tiny minority group of contemporary novelists in French Canada, Ringuet wrote: "Ils semblent tâcher à éviter le danger auquel Hémon lui-même n'a pas échappé et qui consiste à forcer la note héroïque du moment qu'il s'agit des terriens. . . .

La nature de notre pays est assez séduisante, le caractère de nos gens assez particulier pour qu'on raconte leur vie sans se croire obligé à la magnifier." Ringuet's novel of the life of a generation on a thirty-acre farm is in the realistic tradition of Grignon's *Un Homme et son péché* rather than in the lyric tradition of *Maria Chapdelaine*. As a matter of fact, it is high time that the reaction against the Hémon tradition was strengthened; at first an example and an encouragement, this tradition has of late spawned lyric monsters of which one was tempted to remark: "C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas le roman." *30 arpents* actually is a novel, and an honest one, a bit gray and low-ceilinged perhaps, but betraying great skill in dialogue and in the handling of certain specialized types, such as the half-Americanized French Canadians of a New England mill-town. It is critical, sub-acid, and occasionally sombre. "Tous ces gens-là manquent de coeur," is what many French Canadians say of the characters, but that is partly because they have been so long accustomed to a world of fiction in which men and women wore their hearts on their sleeves, stamped with a cross and a fleur-de-lys. The reading public of a decade hence may have the same esteem for Eucharist Moisan and his family that they have today for Samuel Chapdelaine and his.

M. Léo-Paul Desrosiers is probably the most urbane and the most literary of living French-Canadian novelists. So it is flattering, no doubt, but not unfitting that his *Engagés du Grand Portage* should have been published by the most discriminating of Paris houses, Gallimard—N.R.F. His novel deals with the fur-trade in the days of Simon McTavish and its four parts correspond to four geographical settings: the summer trip by canoe from Montreal to the head of the Lakes, and three successive winters at trading-posts on the Great Slave Lake, the Saskatchewan, and the Red River. The few characters emerge from that solid foundation of carefully controlled erudition which is so typical of M. Desrosiers' novels. The reader gets at once the feel of the West, a region in the main surprisingly neglected by French-Canadian novelists. The atmosphere of unscrupulous rivalry between the great fur-trading companies is also admirably rendered. From the point of view of the behaviour of the characters, the novel is perhaps a little less successful. Nicholas Montour, the *arriviste*, a sort of Julien Sorel of the Canadian West, has undoubted reality, but his

foil, Louison Turenne, seems at times too trusting and noble to be always entirely convincing.

Among the novels of lesser moment is Marie LeFranc's *Pêcheurs de Gaspésie*. Mlle LeFranc is not used to keeping the company of minor writers, but it must be admitted that her latest novel lacks both the vitality and the technical competence of *La Rivière solitaire* or even *La Randonnée passionnée*. Perhaps the fact that the author has deserted the Canadian forest for the Gulf and Bonaventure Island accounts in part for the deficiency, but there is also a certain hesitancy and looseness of narration which is disconcerting, while the main theme, that of the subdued Darby and Joan *roman d'amour* between the widow Lauzon and old John Bradley, seems anaemic rather than delicate. For all that, the novel includes many fine pages of description and furnishes a notable social document on the economic distress of the Gaspé fishermen. No reader will soon forget the picture of the priest of a destitute coastal parish who works as a fish-salter and whose cassock is so threadbare that he dare not wear it except to celebrate Mass. That is a Gaspé which the tourists somehow do not see.

Sanatorium, by the singer Paul Dufault, is an unassuming Canadian second-cousin to Thomas Mann's *Magic Mountain*. M. Dufault places some interesting invalids in a Laurentian institution for consumptives, where the rules regarding the segregation of the sexes seem unduly severe, even for persons whose temperature should be kept close to normal. J. U. Dumont's "*Le Pays du Domaine*" is in reality a mildly entertaining book about a motor trip through Abitibi; the thread of fiction running through it is pretty tenuous and it is difficult to care much whether Julie marries Roméo or Almanzor. Of Annette Cantin's *L'Empreinte de mes premières idées* the kindest thing that can be said is that it is written in very curious French and embodies many strange illusions about life.

No discussion of the novel in 1938 would be complete without some mention of the appearance in Toronto of an English translation of Jean-Charles Harvey's *Demi-civilisés*. *Sackcloth for Banner*, as M. Lukin Barette's adequate translation is entitled, gives English Canadians an opportunity to read the book which some years ago roused such a tempest in a tea-pot among certain French-Canadian reactionaries. They will doubtless be surprised to find how harmless

and moderate it is, and they may not be much impressed with it as a novel.

The theatre has always been the weakest member of the French-Canadian literary family, and 1938 brought no appreciable change in this situation. *Dollard*, a three-act play in verse by Gire Maiguéret, is not without dramatic and literary merit. Hugo and Rostand are its godfathers and there are quite fine passages, notably Brassier's invocation to the plough in the third act, which begins:

> . . . Derrière un régiment de moucherons,
> Je la vois qui me tend de loin ses mancherons.
> Les armons sont fendus et la happe est cassée,
> Mais je l'aime toujours comme une fiancée.
> Quand je boudais d'avoir, du matin jusqu'au soir,
> Après chaque sillon à racler son versoir,
> Elle avait sa façon à elle, l'enjoleuse,
> De fredonner une romance merveilleuse. . . .

The play would be improved by the omission in the first act of an anachronistic vision of a file of emigrants leaving for the United States; both Dollard and the audience have plenty to keep them busy without this intrusion.

By its edifying conclusion, *Le Curé Hébert*, by the Abbé Laurent Tremblay, is manifestly intended for parochial performance, but it deserves a better fate. Father Tremblay has a real sense of dramatic values and his *habitants* are flesh-and-blood peasants whose conversation is lively and amusing. The play deals with the first organized attempts to colonize the Lake St. John district in 1849. *Le Français en I ronde*, by Joseph Desilets, criticizes the degree of anglification which is to be found in Parisian French; the author need hardly have gone so far afield. René Bergeron's *Tim et Jos: Au cimetière des objections* is an example of the drama shackled to the cause of anti-Communist propaganda. In it the wicked Red abandons his heresy after a very few pages of dialogue.

M. Louvigny de Montigny has made the outstanding contribution of the year in the field of criticism. *La Revanche de Maria Chapdelaine* is of special interest for two reasons. Because, in the first place, we seem to be reaching the end of what might be called the Maria Chapdelaine period, and a survey of the novel's literary fortune is useful at such a moment. And, secondly, because the author of this volume of criticism himself played such an important

role in the launching of Hémon's novel. It was he in fact who was chiefly responsible for the publication of the first edition in book-form (Montreal, 1916). M. Louvigny de Montigny is particularly interesting when he analyses the causes of the curious hostility to the novel which manifested itself in certain French-Canadian circles. He has also some amusing remarks to make on the Duvivier film version, and breaks a lance or two with certain French critics. On one occasion, when he confuses "symbolique" and "symboliste" in discussing a judgment of Louis Dalbis, it is he who is unhorsed.

The second volume of criticism is in English. *Essential Traits of French-Canadian Poetry*, by Miss Jane M. Turnbull, appears to have originated as a doctorate thesis and it has the elaborate documentation which such a work should embody. For purposes of reference Dr Turnbull's book is really valuable, but there its usefulness ends. The author leans far too heavily on the old-fashioned critics for her judgments and produces largely a rather flowery English echo of Mgr Camille Roy. It is doubtful whether any English Canadian would be encouraged by a reading of this book to explore the French-Canadian poets for himself. It is a matter of real regret that the first serious work in English on this field, since the appearance of Dr Lorne Pierce's book, should fall so far short of a reasonable goal.

The rest of the year's criticism is scattered through the reviews. Certain new departures of 1938 should be briefly chronicled. In the November number of his monthly *Pamphlets*, Valdombre, with an interesting essay on Nérée Beauchemin, inaugurates a series of articles on literary worthies of the past. In *Le Mauricien*, Michel Gauvin imitates with but partial success the well-known French interviewer Frédéric Lefèvre and his *Une Heure avec . . .* series. M. Gauvin hunts his prey among French-Canadian men of letters. In the February number of *La Relève* appeared an interesting article by M. Stanislas Fumet, "Baudelaire en 1938," in which he warns his readers against the facile and far too widespread assumption that Baudelaire is a sort of Catholic poet in disguise.

It seems to have been an open season for biographies in 1938. And as the six volumes under this heading deal with the lives of persons who were active under the British régime, and mainly in the nineteenth century, it seems appropriate to take them up in a rough chronological order.

Aaron Hart was the first Jew to settle in Canada. He arrived

as an officer in one of Amherst's American regiments, took up residence in Three Rivers after the Conquest, and reigned there as a sort of oriental satrap until his death in 1799. That he was an unmitigated scoundrel is hardly the fault of his co-religionaries. It is a pity that Hart's able biographer, M. Raymond Douville, should have been tempted to use his subject as a peg on which he every now and then hangs anti-Semitic preachments.

The poetess Hélène Charbonneau has written the life of Marie-Louise-Cécile-Emma Lajeunesse, better known as Mme Albani, the French-Canadian Jenny Lind. Born at Chambly in 1847, she was dragooned into becoming an infant prodigy of the concert-stage by her fatuous parent. Europe was the scene of her real triumphs, and when she retired it was to live in England, where she died in 1930. *L'Albani* is a conscientious chapter in musical history rather than a satisfactory biography, and the lay reader will regret that the singer does not emerge more definitely as a living person.

L'Institut Canadien de Montréal et L'Affaire Guibord does not sound much like the title of a biography, and Father Théophile Hudon S.J. may be surprised to find his book in this company. But it is a biography, the biography of a particularly lively corpse, which, from its temporary resting-place in the Protestant Cemetery of Montreal, kept all Canada agog between 1869 and 1875. By the time the body was finally buried in the Côte des Neiges Cemetery under the protection of the militia and in accordance with a judgment of the Privy Council, poor Guibord had long ceased to care about such matters as diocesan rights under the Articles of Capitulation, but the disposal of his remains furnished a dramatic chapter in the history of the struggle in Canada between the State and the Catholic Church, between civil and canon law. Father Hudon carefully studies the background of the incident, which is to be found in the clash between Mgr Bourget of Montreal and the liberal group of the Institut Canadien to which Guibord belonged. It seems that the depraved members of this study club had on the shelves of their library such sinful works as Pascal's *Provinciales*, Lamartine's *Jocelyn*, Lamennais' *Paroles d'un croyant*, and that they refused to remove them. Father Hudon takes, of course, a strong pro-Catholic stand on the whole affair, but even readers who disagree with him entirely will find the volume profitable reading.

M. Robert Rumilly's *Mgr Laflèche et son temps* conveniently carries forward the story of the conflict between liberal and ultramontane elements in French Canada. A heroic missionary-priest in western Canada in the eighteen-forties, Mgr Laflèche was made Bishop of Three Rivers and soon became known as the most intransigent of the foes of those "errors" which Pius IX had condemned in his Syllabus. He lived long enough to witness the triumph of Laurier and the hated Liberal party in 1896. The bishop also had strong ideas on the language question. "J'aime assez rencontrer des compatriotes qui parlent mal l'anglais," was a remark he was fond of making in all places and seasons. In this respect Monseigneur's mantle seems to have fallen on the shoulders of certain Montreal school commissioners of the present day. M. Rumilly, as his earlier biography of Mercier showed, knows this period intimately. He quotes extensively but pertinently from the press of the time, particularly with regard to the vexed question of the intervention of the clergy in elections. When the boundaries of diocese and constituency did not coincide amusing situations sometimes arose, as is evidenced by this conversation between *habitants* from two different parts of Laprairie-Napierville:

> —"C'est-il péché de voter rouge, dans votre paroisse?
> —"Non, chez nous c'est pas péché pan toute.
> —"Chanceux!

Puyjalon: Le Solitaire de l'Ile-à-la-Chasse, by Damase Potvin, runs along for the first few pages as a novel, develops into a biography and is at the same time a treatise on the geography, flora and fauna of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There is no harm in the literary mixture, for Count Henry de Puyjalon was himself a curious compound of adventurer, hermit, and conservationist. He came to Canada in the last decades of the nineteenth century, lost his fortune, lived for several years as a lighthouse-keeper, and died on his favourite island in the Gulf in 1905. M. Potvin is at once his biographer and his disciple, for he makes the same pleas for the conservation of the natural resources of Canadian Labrador that Puyjalon made in vain.

Professor Hermas Bastien is responsible for a volume on Olivar Asselin, which contains a short biography and an anthology of some of Asselin's best articles and speeches. Professor Bastien has been charged with plagiarism by several of his compatriots, but there is no need to go into that here. A more pertinent question

is whether or not the present biography is adequate. The answer is that it is not. As with similar works on Asselin which appeared in 1937, the text from Asselin is interesting, the biography and commentary infinitely less so.

Of these six biographies all can be read with profit, but they have one defect in common. Erudite, conscientious, and well documented as they all are, they fail for the most part to present living subjects, and that is perhaps because they are too erudite, too conscientious, and too well documented. Thus Aaron Hart disappears under a whirl of wills and contracts, Mme Albani is drowned in concert programmes, Guibord in legal arguments, Asselin in M. Bastien's rather rotund periods. Mgr Laflèche is perhaps the one who survives best; at least we know that his favourite oath was "Cent trente-deux!"

Also in the field of biography, but different in kind from the books considered above, is Madeleine Gleason-Huguenin's *Portraits de femmes*, a series of nearly one hundred and fifty short lives of famous Canadian women.

Among the authors of volumes of essays must be numbered Lady Tweedsmuir. Her *Carnets canadiens* contain interesting articles on the diary of Lady Aylmer, Canadian folklore, and the Canadian seasons. This is surely the first occasion on which an occupant of Rideau Hall has published a book in the other language of the Dominion.

A work defying orthodox classification is Dr Clermont Bourget's *Douze Ans chez les sauvages*. The author, who was employed as an Indian Agent in the district of the Great Slave Lake from 1923 to 1935, sets down his experiences with great good humour and charm. He seems to have been particularly amused by the fact that his duties made him responsible for the morals of a distinctly wayward tribe, and in this connection one of his many uninhibited anecdotes can safely be quoted:

> Un Père à l'Ile à la Crosse, jeune au pays et ne connaissant pas la langue, prêchait avec l'aide d'un interprète et parlait de la *chasteté*; notre dévoué interprète, chez qui des sujets abstraits avaient l'effet des théories d'Einstein, expliquait aux sauvages que le Père recommandait la *chasse d'été*, et "malgré nos expériences passées, dit-il, que la chasse d'hiver est la meilleure, il faut suivre l'avis du Père qui nous recommande la *chasse d'été*."

In the field of history proper the work of greatest distinction in 1938 was M. Gérard Filteau's *Histoire des Patriotes* (vol. I).

This historian won his spurs not long ago with his two-volume *Naissance d'une race*. A "Nationalist" historian of the school of the Abbé Groulx, M. Filteau has the immense advantage over his master that he does not confuse eloquence with rhetoric. He can write movingly and with authority of the wrongs suffered by his compatriots in the past without seeming at all times to be addressing a large public meeting. In his study of the background of the events of 1837 he has particularly good chapters on the scandalous land-grants in the Eastern Townships and on general conditions in that part of the province, also a careful analysis of the characters of the several patriot leaders and of their specific aims. Like so many French-Canadian historians, M. Filteau is rather prone to build substantial theoretical edifices on sweeping generalizations regarding race. For instance: "L'esprit anglo-saxon est positif: il s'attache aux faits, aux chiffres; il y a en lui énormément de matérialisme. L'esprit latin accorde la prédominance au spirituel. . . ." If this is to help explain the Rebellion of 1837 in the Lower Province, how does one account then for the "chouayen," or pro-Family-Compact attitude of so many French-Canadian clerics and professional and business men? If such a theory explains Colonel Gugy, does it explain Dr Wolfred Nelson?

Dr Nelson, incidentally, comes in for a detailed tribute to his powers as a military leader in a modest booklet, *Les Evénements de 1837 à Saint-Denis-sur-Richelieu*, by his colleague and venerable successor Dr J. B. Richard.

In *Archives et souvenirs*, Jean Dombreval, a member of the order, gives a series of historical studies of events and persons connected with the Messieurs de Saint-Sulpice. There was also in 1938 the usual number of exhaustive studies in regional history. Chief among these were the first volume of a comprehensive *Histoire du Saguenay*, edited by a group of local historians, a history of *Saint-Jean de Québec* by the Abbé Jean-Dominique Brosseau, and M. Pierre Trudelle's personal diary of events in Abitibi during the last twenty-eight years, *L'Abitibi d'autrefois et d'aujourd'hui*.

It has been customary in these surveys to conclude with a section devoted to works on contemporary problems. The moderate tone of these works, by contrast with that of previous years, was mentioned at the beginning of this essay. This moderation is perhaps less obvious in an apology for corporatism by the Abbé

Thomas M. Lamarche (*A qui le pouvoir? A qui l'argent?*) and in Professor Hermas Bastien's *Le Bilinguisme au Canada.* In the latter study the ghost of Mgr Laflèche walks again. "Plus nous savons d'anglais," writes Professor Bastien, "plus nous rétrogradons dans l'ordre économique." A good deal more conciliatory are the volumes of essays by MM. Léopold Richer and Paul Gouin. M. Richer, in *Notre Problème politique*, takes advantage of the activities of the Rowell Commission to comment on the conflicting theses of a strengthened central government and a broader regional autonomy. He quotes extensively from English-Canadian commentators, though largely to combat their arguments. His own doctrine is stated forcefully but without fanaticism, and may be summed up in his own words as follows:

> Nous resterons dans la Confédération; mais la Confédération devra se concilier avec notre volonté de survie et d'épanouissement français. Et la formule exige bien autre chose que le respect du bilinguisme fédéral et notre juste part dans le fonctionnarisme canadien. Province française, nationalité française, nous ne pouvons le rester sans une certaine autonomie législative et administrative, en particulier dans l'ordre économique et social.

Servir is by Paul Gouin, one of the younger political leaders of the province and now in temporary eclipse. In one of his essays he makes an interesting evaluation of the various political forces and ideologies in Quebec, and, among other virtues, must be given credit for his criticism of the sacrosanct Padlock Law. He seems to view it as a piece of panic legislation which should be considerably modified. In *La Participation des Canadiens-Français à la Grande Guerre*, Jacques Michel (the Abbé Poisson) attacks certain charges made by M. André Siegfried in his recent work, *Le Canada, puissance internationale.* M. Siegfried had fallen into the all too common French error of imagining that French Canadians "owed" a duty to France and should have flocked to the colours in 1914. How many Frenchmen, wonders Jacques Michel, would fight to save Canada from obliteration? Unfortunately he does not confine his arguments to the main question at issue and unafraid pursues M. Siegfried onto the totally unfamiliar ground of French history with disastrous results.

The survey of books on contemporary questions may well close with Mr Wilfrid Bovey's *French-Canadians To-day.* This work is a continuation and an expansion of *Canadien* and combines, as the earlier volume did, the author's intimate and often happily

expressed knowledge of French Canada with an iron resolution to justify anything and everything that any French Canadian has done, said or thought anywhere at any time. Even Baptiste's best friends must fail to recognize him so thickly coated with whitewash from head to foot.

VI. NEW-CANADIAN LETTERS — Watson Kirkconnell

Probably the most significant event of the year 1938 in New-Canadian letters is the appearance of the first instalment of the Icelandic *Letters and Essays* of the late Stephan G. Stephansson (d. 1927). Published in Reykjavík, and edited with scholarly care by his literary executor, Dr Rögnvaldur Pétursson, they throw a fascinating light on the mind of the greatest of Icelandic-Canadian writers. This first of several projected volumes comprises only selected correspondence from June, 1889, to Easter, 1909; and of the 109 lengthy letters in the collection, 75 are written to three of his friends, Jónas Hall, Eggert Jóhannsson, and Jóhann Magnús Bjarnason. It is with the last-named, a veteran novelist now living at Elfros, that he discusses his literary interests most fully. The authors whom he lists as his current enthusiasms in 1899 are Tolstoy and Turgeniev among the Russians; Kielland and Björnstierne among the Norwegians; Sudermann in Germany; Hugo and Zola in France; and Dickens, George Eliot, Hardy, Kipling, Stevenson, Haggard, Sylvanus Cobb, Ian Maclaren, and Hall Caine in English. The list, with one or two strange lapses, suggests an active and virile mind. It is to be hoped that the remaining volumes of these *Letters and Essays* will not be unduly delayed; for it is obvious that no serious biography of Stephansson can be attempted until all of this material has been made accessible.

Professor Richard Beck has continued his valuable studies of Icelandic-Canadian poets with a full-length essay on Jón Runólfsson in the *Tímarit* of the National League and with a slighter sketch, in *Heimskringla* of the poetry of Jóhann Magnús Bjarnason; while O. T. Lone and others have contributed to *Norrona* a symposium on the future of the Norse language in Canada. The Rev. Gudmundur Árnason of Lundar and the Rev. Dr Rögnvaldur Pétursson of Winnipeg have both contributed to the *Tímarit* valuable notes on the background of Icelandic life in Canada; but the chief recent historian of this national group is Th. Th. Thorsteinsson, with two

stout volumes: *Vestmenn*, dealing with the record of the Icelanders in North America, and *Æfintyrid frá Islandi til Brasilíu*, tracing in detail the development of an important Icelandic colony in Brazil as the result of migrations in 1863 and 1873. Mr Thorsteinsson bids fair to become the official historian of the Icelandic *Diaspora*.

In poetry, the best work of the year is *Kertaljós* ("Candle-light"), a charming volume of selected poems by Jakobína Johnson, covering the two decades, 1918-38. Mrs Johnson is notable among Icelandic-Canadian poets for the quality of warm, womanly feeling that she infuses into her verse. Her subjects are usually taken from the simple range of everyday experience, but her genuine poetic gifts kindle these into permanent human significance. The title-poem of the present volume is written in the old alliterative measure of the Germanic peoples, although the hemistichs are printed as two lines, instead of one as in Old English. The poem may be translated thus:

CANDLE-LIGHT

All I loved yesterday
in youth's fair morning
is dear to me today,
though dim remembered:
the rosy dawning,
the rainbow in the sky,
the verdure of the springtime,
the violet in the hollow.

Now fall the autumn shadows,
come frosty tempests,
and evening lamplight
is lit for story-reading.
Soon comes our Christmas,
a climax of rapture!
On the table is kindled
the candle-light!

Though electric lamps
now lighten the darkness
of half the world
on the Holy Night,
yet dearest to me
are the dreaming candles
of hallowed remembrance.
—Happy Christmas!

More extensive in bulk but less authentically poetic is *Ómar* ("Chimes") by Jóhannes H. Húnfjörd. More than half of the

poems in this large collection have been written for special occasions or as compliments to individuals; many are elaborately and devotedly wrought out in technique; but as all too often happens with the occasional verse of poets laureate everywhere, the fire usually refuses to fall from heaven and kindle the imposing pyre of the priest on Carmel. The fault is perhaps less in the poet than in a type of poetry that by its nature lacks any deep authenticity of emotional experience. Among Ukrainian-Canadian poets, only Wasyl Tulewitrow has this year published any verse in book-form. *Dumy i pisni* ("Musings and Songs") is a collection of 113 poems covering a period of twenty-five years of poetic activity. Mr Tulewitrow is a former medical student, who escaped from the Ukraine in 1919 and has ever since been a steel-worker in Hamilton, Ontario. His parents died of hunger in Russia in 1921, and he himself has known privation. As a result, the harsher side of life is stressed in his writings. Among his poems are such titles as "Song of the Unemployed in Canada," "Song of the Under-dog," "Distress," "Grief," "Discord," and "Ukrainian Invalid." In the case of one who escaped from the falling ruins of the short-lived Ukrainian republic, it is natural that a strong strain of Ukrainian nationalism pervades his poetry, and that the Ukraine, rather than Canada, is the object of his keenest solicitude.

In drama, Alexis Luhovy has published three more plays. His latest thriller, *Bez Vyny Karani* ("Punished without Guilt") is a four-acter dealing with a Ukrainian immigrant-labourer who gets unhappily mixed up with Communist agitators. Inasmuch as all his earlier plays had their setting in,revolutionary Russia, this new work is a welcome indication that his interest is at last shifting to Canadian themes.

In fiction, there has not been a voluminous output during the year. The Rev. Ivan Kmeta of Saskatoon has been publishing in the press a striking series of short stories which he calls his "America-cycle;" but in the book field there is only one volume of genuine importance, viz., the collected Icelandic fiction of Gudrún Finnsdóttir (Mrs Gísli Johnson, of Winnipeg), entitled *Hillingalönd* ("Land of Mirage"). This large volume has fine qualities all its own. In Mrs Johnson's fiction there is no swift, saga-like simplicity and directness of narration. Some of her stories have very little movement at all, and tend rather towards the impressionistic analysis of a mood or a situation. But the slowness of the action is

compensated for by the pervasive presence of a fine and gracious personality—keenly sensitive to the charm, the nobility, and the pathos of human life. Most of the settings are recognizably in Western Canada, and range from 100 degrees in the shade on Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, to the murderous cold of the prairie winter. Again and again she comes back to the class-room of the Western school-mistress and the affectionate devotion of her small charges. Who could forget, after her telling the tale, the shy Christmas-gift of three shrivelled turnips from the poor little girl who herself had no prospect of anything for Christmas? Canadian life takes on winsome radiance in this book.

Written in English but vitally related to the New-Canadian field is John Murray Gibbon's *Canadian Mosaic*, a fascinating and comprehensive survey of all the racial and national groups that are being blended together to form the Canadian nation of tomorrow. Mr Gibbon, with persistent industry, has gathered a surprising wealth of material regarding not only the European background of these groups but also (and far more fully) the story of their settlement in Canada, their group achievement in this country, and the record of distinguished individuals in Canadian life. This collective record of the part they have already played in Canadian music, art, literature, science, and the professions must be a revelation to the average Anglo-Canadian. If, as is certain, mutual regard, based on a sympathetic knowledge of each other's worth, can help in the cementing together of all the colourful elements in our "Canadian mosaic," Mr Gibbon has rendered a great service to this country.

LISTS OF PUBLICATIONS

FRENCH-CANADIAN[1]

I. CULTURAL AND LITERARY HISTORY OF CANADA

A. Selected Works of Reference

Société des Ecrivains canadiens. Deuxième bulletin bibliographique, Année 1938. Montréal, La Société, Ecole Normale, 24pp.

Antoine Roy, Ouvrages et articles sur Mgr de Laval (liste partielle) (*BRH* avril 115-18).

B. Selected Studies in Historical and Contemporary Background

Benoist (Emile), L'Abitibi pays de l'or. (Collection du Zodiaque deuxième.) Montréal, Edns. du Zodiaque, 207pp., $1.00. Revd. *AU* sept. **Bourget (Clermont)**, Douze ans chez les sauvages: Au Grand-Lac des Esclaves, comme médecin et agent des Indiens (1923-1935). Ste-Anne-de-Beaupré, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 253pp., $1.00. **Bovey (Wilfrid)**, The French Canadians to-day: A people on the march. Toronto, Dent, xii, 362 pp., $3.00. **Brosseau (Jean-Dominique)**, Saint-Jean-de-Québec. St-Jean, P.Q., Le "Richelieu," 112, rue St-Jacques, 319pp., $2.00. **Dombreval (Jean)**, Archives et souvenirs. Drummondville, P.Q., La Parole, 259pp., $1.00. **Gouin (Paul)**, Servir: I. La cause nationale. (Collection du Zodiaque deuxième.) Montréal, Edns. du Zodiaque, 251pp., 75c. Revd. *AU* fév. 1939. **Groulx (Lionel)**, La naissance d'une race. Ed. nouvelle. Montréal, Granger, 385pp., $1.00. L'histoire du Saguenay: Depuis l'origine jusqu'à 1870. Tome I. (Publication de la Société Historique du Saguenay, no. 3.) Ed. du Centenaire. Chicoutimi, La Société, 331pp., $1.25. **Hudon (Théophile)**, L'Institut canadien de Montréal et l'affaire Guibord: Une page d'histoire. Montréal, Beauchemin, 173pp., 75c. Revd. *AU* fév.; *CFran.* sept., nov.; *Le Mauricien* mars. **Michel (Jacques)**, La participation des Canadiens français à la grande guerre: Réponse à un livre récent de M. André Siegfried, "Le Canada, puissance internationale." (Documents sociaux.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 192pp. Revd. *AU* mai; *CFran.* sept. **Morice (A.-G.)**, La race métisse: Etude critique en marge d'un livre récent. Winnipeg, chez l'auteur, 200, rue Austin, 91pp. **Morin (Wilfrid)**, L'Avenir du Canada: Nos droits à l'indépendance politique. Préface du T. R. P. Yves de la Brière. Paris, Fernand Sorlot, 253pp., 30 frs. **Richard (J.-B.)**, Les événements de 1837 à Saint-Denis-Sur-Richelieu. (Documents maskoutains, no. 2.) Saint-Hyacinthe, P.Q., Société d'Histoire régionale de Saint-Hyacinthe, 48pp. Revd. *AU* sept. **Richer (Léopold)**, Notre problème politique. (Documents politiques.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 157pp. Revd. *AU* sept. **Roy (Camille)**, L'avenir des minorités françaises au Canada: Discours prononcé au 9ème Congrès général de l'Association canadienne-française d'Education d'Ontario, à Ottawa, le 12 octobre 1938. Québec, Action catholique, 14pp. **Simard (Georges)**, Etudes canadiennes: Education, politique, choses d'église. Montréal, Beauchemin; Ottawa, Edns. de l'Université, 224pp., $1.00. Revd. *RUO* janv.-mars 1939. **Taché (Louis)**, Le nord de l'Outaouais:

[1]These lists were prepared in the Editorial Office of the University of Toronto Press, by Miss Merle Storey.

All references in the lists are to 1938 except when another date is given. Following many of the items listed, attention is drawn to more extended reviews in other periodicals. An asterisk marks the names of those authors whom we believe not to be Canadians. The following abbreviations have been used: *AU—Action universitaire; BRH—Bulletin des Recherches historiques; C—Canadian; CFran.—Canada français; Mém. S.R.C.—Mémoires, Société royale du Canada; NC—Nos Cahiers; RD—Revue Dominicaine; RTC—Revue trimestrielle canadienne; RUO—Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa.*

Manuel-répertoire d'histoire et de géographie régionales. Pointe-Gatineau, P.Q., chez l'auteur, Collège Saint-Alexandre, xvi, 396pp., $2.60. Revd. *RUO* avril-juin 1939. **Trudelle (Pierre)**, L'Abitibi: D'autrefois, d'hier, d'aujourd'hui. Amos, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 397pp., $3.00.

Francis-J. Audet, Le barreau et la révolte de 1837 (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 85-96). Marius Barbeau, Nos traditions (*RTC* sept. 290-9). Georges Bouchard, Nous sommes avant tout une race paysanne (*Le Mauricien* déc. 10, 30, 31). Wilfrid Bovey, French Canada and the problem of Quebec (*Nineteenth Century* Jan. 21-35). Lucien Brault, Les Anglais à Deschambault en 1759 (*BRH* juillet 219-21). Jean Bruchési, Canadian unity and the French Canadians (*RTC* juin 116-23). Maximilien Caron, La province de Québec est-elle un état? (*L'Actualité économique* mai 121-32). Le Château de Ramezay et ses hôtes: Extrait d'un ouvrage en cours de publication, par Maître Victor Morin (Association Belgique-Canada oct. 627-9). Amédée Gosselin, Boissons douces et boissons enivrantes chez les colons, 1632-1760 (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 99-108). Jean-Charles Harvey, What Quebec thinks of Canada (*Canadian Magazine* July 3-4, 37). Maurice Hébert, La Noël et le Jour de l'An au Canada français (*CFran.* déc. 307-14). Gustave Lanctot, Influences américaines dans le Québec (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 119-25). Germaine Laplante, L'ordre dans notre culture (*CFran.* oct. 141-6). E.-Z. Massicotte, Un "Digest" canadien d'autrefois (*BRH* déc. 353-4). *H. Miner, Changes in rural French-Canadian culture (*American Journal of Sociology* Nov. 365-78), The French-Canadian family cycle (*American Sociological Review* Oct. 700-8). Edouard Montpetit, Les Canadiens français et l'économique (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 55-79). Victor Morin, Superstitions et croyances populaires (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 51-60). Nationalism in Quebec (*Round Table* March 376-85). Roger Ouimet, The preservation of French-Canadian culture within Confederation (*Problems in Canadian unity* ed. V. Anderson, Toronto, 50-66). Damase Potvin, Evocation des premiers jours: La grande aventure colonisatrice du Saguenay en 1838 (*Le Mauricien* avril-mai 8-11, 36). Pascal Potvin, Les patriotes de 1837-1838 (*CFran.* fév., mars, avril, mai, 567-84, 667-90, 779-93, 891-907). Léon Pouliot, Mgr Lartigue et les patriotes de 1837 (*BRH* mars 71-7). L. A. Prud'homme, La danse du soleil (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 81-3). Camille Roy, Le centenaire de La Vérendrye (*CFran.* oct. 114-22). T. R. Sainte-Marie, Why I dislike the "English" (*Saturday Night* Dec. 3). Georges Simard, Le Canada d'aujourd'hui et de demain (*RUO* avril-juin 141-65). Armand Yon, Un indésirable: L'Apostat Gavazzi au Canada (1853) (*CFran.* déc. 329-47), L'Ottawa vue par les Français: Depuis le XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours (*RUO* oct.-déc. 381-408), Un touriste du Chili au Canada en 1853, Don Benjamin Vicuna-Mackenna (*CFran.* fév. 595-606).

C. Criticism of Canadian Literature and Speech

(a) General and Miscellaneous

Bastien (Hermas), Le bilinguisme au Canada. (Documents sociaux.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 206pp. Revd. *AU* sept. Deuxième Congrès de la langue française au Canada, Québec, 27 juin-1er juillet, 1937. Compte rendu; Mémoires, tomes I-III. Québec, Action catholique, 533, 565, 253, 505pp., $6.00 the set. **Hughes (John)**, La culture bilingue au Canada. (Cahiers de politique étrangère, no. 41.) Paris, Institut des Etudes Américaines, 10pp., 2 frs. **La Rue (Gabriel)**, Pour que vive notre français. (Ecole sociale populaire no. 293.) Montréal, Action paroissiale, 32pp., 15c. ***Léger (Jules)**, Le Canada français et son expression littéraire. Paris, Nizet & Bastard, 213pp., 25 frs.

Hermas Bastien, Le bilinguisme au Canada (*Action nationale* janv.). Gustave M. Charland, "Canadian French" (*Modern Language Journal* May 608-12). Rodolphe Dubé (François Hertel *pseud.*), L'éducation du patriotisme par la langue (*Familia* déc. 15-22). Maurice Hébert, Deux

protagonistes de notre pensée française: MM. Olivar Asselin et Edouard Montpetit (*CFran.* mars 752-67), Un ex-pamphlétaire au service de l'ordre [Victor Barbeau] (*CFran.* fév. 635-51), La pureté de la langue française et de la langue anglaise au Canada: Un double principe de plus haute civilisation dans une nécessaire diversité (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 149-63), Quelques instruments canadiens-français de correction de notre langue (*CFran.* oct. 185-92). GABRIEL LA RUE, Notre français (*CFran.* mai 965-92). CLÉMENT MARCHAND, La France peut-elle s'intéresser à notre littérature? (*Le Mauricien* janv. 16). SÉRAPHIN MARION, Notre "Serment de Strasbourg" (*CFran.* déc. 373-85). OLIVIER MAURAULT, La courte vie des *Mélanges Religieux* (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 1-19). PHILIPPE PANNETON (RINGUET *pseud.*), Les lettres canadiennes (*Les Nouvelles littéraires* [Paris] déc. 31). FELIX WALTER, French-Canadian letters, in Letters in Canada (*University of Toronto Quarterly* July 552-67, 572-89).

(b) Poetry

Turnbull (Jane M.), Essential traits of French-Canadian poetry. Toronto, Macmillan, [x], 225pp., $2.50. Revd. *CBookman* Aug.-Sept.; *Saturday Night* July 16.

EMILE CHARTIER, La vie de l'esprit au Canada français, 6e étude: La poésie—L'Ecole lyrique de Montréal (1890-1920) (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 21-34).

(c) Fiction

Montigny (Louvigny de), La revanche de Maria Chapdelaine: Essai d'initiation à un chef-d'œuvre inspiré du pays de Québec. Préface de RAYMOND BRUGÈRE. (Série les Jugements.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 213pp. Revd. *AU* avril; *RUO* juillet-sept.

MAURICE HÉBERT, Les derniers-nés littéraires de Mme Michelle Le Normand et de son mari M. Léo-Paul Desrosiers (*CFran.* janv. 547-60).

D. Selected Publications in Arts and Crafts in Canada

Henri Julien, 1851-1908: Exposition commémorative. Ottawa, Galerie Nationale du Canada, 15pp.

LORENZO AUGER, Relique du passé: La maison Boudreau à Deschambault (*Le Mauricien* sept. 10-11, 29). MARIUS BARBEAU, Arts et métiers du Québec (*Revue populaire* août 7, 49), Ceintures fléchées (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 109-14), Fils d'or et d'argent (*CFran.* nov. 235-40). EMILE CHARTIER, La vie de l'esprit au Canada français, 9e étude: Les arts, architecture, peinture, sculpture, musique (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 41-54). E. DIX, Le P'tit Pépin [Clermont Pépin, boy pianist and composer of Saint Georges de Beauce] (*Saturday Night* May 14). Maurice Gaudreau: Artiste canadien (*Revue populaire* août 6), J. J. WILFRID GRENIER, Céramistes en Mauricie (*Le Mauricien* nov. 23). OLIVIER MAURAULT, Ozias Leduc, peintre mystique (*Le Mauricien* fév. 4-5, 29). PIERRE NORMANDEAU, La Céramique (*AU* juin 197-8). OSCAR O'BRIEN, L'esthétique de la chanson populaire (*Le Mauricien* janv. 6-7, 31, 32). AIMÉ PLAMONDON, L'Ecole des Beaux-Arts de Québec (*Revue populaire* déc. 5). JEANNE ROCHEFORT, Albert Rousseau: Jeune peintre du vieux Québec (*Le Mauricien* mars 23, 33).

E. Critical Editions, Collections, Translations, etc.

Barette (Lukin) trans., Sackcloth for banner (Les demi-civilisés) by JEAN-CHARLES HARVEY. Toronto, Macmillan, x, 262pp. $2.25. Revd. *CBookman* Feb.-March 1939; *New York Times* Jan. 8, 1939. **Roche-Mazon (Jeanne)** trans., Un homme et des bêtes: Au pays des castors by WA-SHA-QUON-ASIN (GREY OWL). Paris, Boivin, 1937, 336pp., 7.50 frs.

A la claire fontaine (*BRH* mars 85-6). OLIVIER MAURAULT, Les lettres de M. Tronson (*La Société canadienne d'histoire de l'église catholique, rapport* 1936-7, 11-19).

II. POETRY

Bugnet (Georges), Voix de la solitude. Montréal, Edns. du Totem, 150pp., $1.00. Revd. *RD* août. **Dollens (Jean)**, Nostalgies: Poèmes. Sherbrooke, P.Q., chez l'auteur, apt. 3, Monument National, 163pp., $1.00. **Lacasse (Arthur)**, Le défilé des heures: (Choix de poèmes). Québec, Action catholique, xv, 292pp., $1.50. **Lavallée (Jeannine)**, Vice versa. Montréal, Edns. Rénovation, 107pp. **Maiguéret (Gire)**, Dollard. *See* IV A. **Remi** (Frère), Etincelles du cœur. Sainte-Foy, P.Q., chez l'auteur, Scolasticat des Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes, 112pp.

Poems by the following selected writers have appeared: JEAN CHARBONNEAU (*Mém. SRC* XXXII), ALFRED DESROCHERS (*Le Mauricien* janv.), RODOLPHE DUBÉ (FRANÇOIS HERTEL *pseud.*) (*Action nationale* sept., nov.; *Le Mauricien* mars, oct.), JEANNE L'ARCHEVÊQUE-DUGUAY (*CFran.* fév., mars, juin), ALBERT FERLAND (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937; XXXII), MICHEL GAUVIN (*Le Mauricien* mars), MAURICE HÉBERT (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937), ARTHUR LACASSE (*Mém. SRC* XXXII), MAGNANARELLE (*Mém. SRC* XXXII), GÉRARD MARTIN (*Le Mauricien* avril-mai), ADRIEN PINARD (*Carnets du théologue* janv.), ARMAND PLANTE (*Carnets du théologue* avril), GÉRARD RAINVILLE (*Carnets du théologue* oct.), ROGER ROLLAND (*Le Mauricien* mars), ROGER VARIN (*Carnets du théologue* avril; *La Relève* mars).

III. FICTION

A. Novels

Cantin (Annette), L'empreinte de mes premières idées. Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 76pp., 60c. **Daveluy (Marie-Claire)**, Les aventures de Perrine et de Charlot (ed. 2, 189pp., 75c.); La captivité de Charlot (ed. 2, 159pp., 75c.); Charlot à la "Mission des Martyrs" (157pp., 75c.); L'idylle de Charlot (193pp., 75c.). Montréal, Granger. **Desrosiers (Léo-Paul)**, Les engagés du Grand Portage. Paris, Gallimard, 211pp. Revd. *AU* sept.; *CFran.* déc.; *Le Devoir* 3 sept.; *La Relève* oct.; *RD* août; *RUO* avril-juin 1939. **Dufault (Paul)**, Sanatorium. Montréal, Impr. Modèle ltée., 181pp. Revd. *RD* août. **Dumont (J. U.)**, "Le pays du domaine." Préface par ÉDOUARD FORTIN. Amos, P.Q., 215pp., $1.00. ***Le Franc (Marie)**, Pêcheurs de Gaspésie: Roman inédit. Illustrations de L. W. GRAUX. Paris, J. Ferenczi & fils, 159pp., 5 frs. Revd. *Le Jour*, 14 janv., 1939. **Panneton (Philippe)** (RINGUET *pseud.*), 30 arpents. Paris, Flammarion, 293pp., 19 frs. 50. Revd. *Montreal Gazette*, Feb. 18, 1939. **Ringuet.** *See* PANNETON, PHILIPPE.

B. Selected Short Stories

Short stories by the following selected writers have appeared: ROBERT CHARBONNEAU (*La Relève* janv., fév., mars), PHILIPPE CUSSON (*L'Oiseau bleu* sept. 1938—fév. 1939), RAYMOND DOUVILLE (*Le Mauricien* avril), M. ANTOINETTE GRÉGOIRE-COUPAL (*Le Mauricien* août), ANNE HÉBERT (*CFran.* déc.), CÉCILE LAGACÉ (*CFran.* fév., mars), MICHELLE LE NORMAND (*CFran.* mai), MARIE-ROSE TURCOT (*L'Oiseau bleu* déc.).

IV. DRAMA

A. Published Plays

Desilets (Joseph), Le Français en 1 ronde: Fantaisie en un acte. Victoriaville, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 35pp. **Dugré (Alexandre)**, Les premières (Tract no. 16; 15pp.); Une sérieuse de pêche. (Tract no. 15; 16pp.). Montréal, La Ligue missionnaire des étudiants. **Hébert (Louis-Philippe)**, Les mains rouges: Radio-roman. Montréal, J.-D. de Lamirande et cie, 70pp. **Lamarche (Gustave)**, Le cantique du gardeur: Bergerie chorale (Ottawa, Collège Bruyère, 34pp. miméo.; produced at Bruyère College); La défaite de l'enfer: Jeu choral évangélique (Montréal, Librairie Saint-Viateur, 62pp., 10c.; revd. *Carnets du*

théologue oct.; produced at Rigaud). **Maiguéret (Gire)**, Dollard: Drame en trois actes (en vers). Dumas, Sask., chez l'auteur, 202pp., $1.00. Revd. *CFran.* janv. 1939. **Prévost (Arthur)**, Maldonne. Montréal, Radio-compilation, 11861, rue Pasteur, 26pp. Received Sir Barry Jackson award for best presentation of original Canadian play at Dominion Drama Festival, 1938. **Tremblay (Laurent)**, Le Curé Hébert: Drame social en trois actes avec épilogue. Notre-Dame d'Hébertville, P.Q., Le comité de Notre-Dame d'Hébertville des fêtes du centenaire du Saguenay, 97pp., 25c. Revd. *CFran.* déc.

Anne Hébert, Enfants à la fenêtre (*CFran.* avril 822-5).

See V D (G. Bugnet, R. Juneau).

B. Selected List of Plays Produced

Andrée Basillières, Le médecin de l'âme (Montreal Repertory Theatre). Robert Choquette, Le billet de sweepstake (Montreal Repertory Theatre). Louis Francœur, Trio à quatre (Montreal Repertory Theatre).

V. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE

A. Biography and Autobiography

Bastien (Hermas), Olivar Asselin. Montréal, Bernard Valiquette, 221pp., $1.00. **Bergeron (Henri-Paul)**, Le Frère André C.S.C.: L'apôtre de Saint Joseph. Montréal, Oratoire Saint-Joseph du Mont-Royal, 267pp., $1.00. Revd. *Le séminaire* août. **Boismenu (Léo)**, Le bienheureux Pierre-Julien Eymard, 1811-1868. (L'œuvre des tracts, no. 227.) Montréal, Action paroissiale, 16pp., 10c. **Charbonneau (Hélène)**, L'Albani: Sa carrière artistique et triomphale. Préface de Victor Morin. Montréal, chez l'auteur, 6417, rue Delorimier, 171pp., $1.00. **Douville (Raymond)**, Aaron Hart: Récit historique. Trois-Rivières, Edns. du Bien Public, 194pp., $1.00. Revd. *Saturday Night*, Feb. 11, 1939. **Huguenin (Madeleine G.)**, Portraits de femmes. Montréal, Edns. La Patrie, 273pp. **Langevin (F.)**, Monseigneur Louis-Zéphyrin Moreau: Quatrième évêque de Saint-Hyacinthe, 1824-1901. Lettre-préface de son excellence Mgr Fabien-Zoël Decelles. Québec, Action catholique, 1937, 255pp., 60c. **Nadeau (Eugène)**, Thérèse Gélinas, 1925-1934. Trois-Rivières, Œuvre Thérèse Gélinas, 163pp. **Potvin (Damase)**, Puyjalon: Le solitaire de l'Ile-à-la-Chasse. Préface de L. A. Richard. (Les Oubliés, no. 1.) Beauceville, P. Q., La Cie de "L'Eclaireur" ltée., 168pp. **Rumilly (Robert)**, Mgr Laflèche et son temps. (Collection du Zodiaque deuxième.) Montréal, Edns. du Zodiaque, 425pp., $1.00.

Maurice Brodeur, Joseph Marmette: Archiviste, historien, romancier (*CFran.* fév. 607-17). Georges Bugnet, Le P. Carmel Brouillard, critique littéraire (*Les Idées* mai). Pierre Daviault, Berthier de Villemure (*Le Mauricien* janv. 14, 34). M.-Marcel Lamarche, La mort de Jacques Buteux (*Le Mauricien* juin 12, 30). Maurice Lebel, G. K. Chesterton (1874-1937) (*RD* fév. 80-95). Richard Lessard, Alexandre Berthier, seigneur de Berthier (*Echo de St-Justin* 5 mai), H. Randin, premier seigneur de Berthier (*Echo de St-Justin* 31 mars), Le révérend père Denis Baron, récollet (*Echo de St-Justin* 19 mars). Léon Lortie, Georges Urbain, 1872-1938 (*AU* déc. 11-13). Olivier Maurault, La carrière de l'Abbé Groulx (*C Historical Association report* 97-102). Léon Pouliot, Le père Nicolas Point (1799-1868): Collaborateur du P. de Smet dans les Montagnes rocheuses et missionnaire en Ontario (*La Société canadienne d'histoire de l'église catholique, rapport* 1936-7, 20-30).

See also VI A (*BRH*; also G. Bouchard, O. Maurault, V. Morin, E. F. Surveyer).

B. Sketches: Narrative, Descriptive, Reflective, and Humorous

Buchan (Susan), See Tweedsmuir, Lady. **Darveau (Jacqueline)**, Randonnée au pays des totems: Récit. Québec, chez l'auteur, 9 Place Georges V,

170pp. **Gervais (Emile)**, Un mois en Chine: Avec les Sœurs Missionnaires N.-D. des Anges du Diocèse de Sherbrooke. Préface de l'abbé ELIE-J. AUCLAIR. Sherbrooke, P.Q., Messager St-Michel, 1937, 129pp. Revd. *CF* avril. **Lefebvre (Justin)**, Impressions d'un voyage. Saint-Joseph d'Alma, P. Q., 1937, 151pp., 75c. **Otis (L.-Eugène)**, Saint-Alexis de Grande-Baie 1838-1938. (Publications de la Société du Saguenay, no. 4.) A l'occasion du Centenaire de la Paroisse 11 juin 1938. Chicoutimi, La Société, 48pp. **Tweedsmuir,** Lady (SUSAN BUCHAN), Carnets canadiens. (Collection du Zodiaque deuxième.) Montréal, Edns. du Zodiaque, 163pp. $1.00. Revd *AU* mars; *CFran.* avril; *RD* juin.

PAUL BEAULIEU, Images de Pologne (*La Relève* fév. 38-45). LEO COX, L'appel du Labrador: Une croisière de luxe aux confins des terres polaires (*Association Belgique-Canada* sept. 609, 611). LÉO-PAUL DESROSIERS, Commencements: Un édifice fragile s'écroule (*CFran.* sept. 37-56), numerous articles on history (*Action catholique, Le Devoir, Le Droit, La Tribune*). RAYMOND DOUVILLE, Un duel aux Trois-Rivières (*Revue populaire* avril 7, 56). LOUIS FRANCŒUR, "A tale of two cities" [Québec et Montréal] (*Le Mauricien* sept. 4-5, 31). E. JUCHEREAU-DUCHESNAY, L'Ile-aux-Grues (*La Revue moderne* janv. 6, 7). ROMÉO JUNEAU, La Richelanie: La vallée du Richelieu (*Le Richelieu* 29 sept., 6 oct.). OLIVIER MAURAULT, Louisiane et Texas (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 165-82). JULIEN PEGHAIRE, A Tours, sur les traces de Marie de l'Incarnation (*RD* nov. 186-97). F.-ANTOINE SAVARD, Un homme laboure: Visions abitibiennes (*Le Mauricien* déc. 11, 31).

See also I B.

C. Critical Essays

[**Grignon (C.-H.**)], Les Pamphlets de Valdombre. Deuxième année. Sainte-Adèle, (Terrebonne), P.Q. Issued monthly.

PAUL BEAULIEU, "Le Noel sur la place" d'Henri Ghéon (*La Relève* janv. 17-19), Réflexions sur "l'Echange" [par Claudel] (*La Relève* avril 97-101). JOSEPH-OCTAVE BÉGIN, Genèse d'une vocation d'apologiste [Bossuet] (*CFran.* nov. 203-24). EMILE CHARTIER, Promenade en forêt: La nuit en Amérique [Chateaubriand] (*RUO* juillet-sept. 273-91). ROGER DUHAMEL, Promenade avec Chardonne (*AU* déc. 8-10). PAUL FONTAINE, Les "Plaideurs" de Racine (*CFran.* nov. 269-84). STANISLAS FUMET, Baudelaire en 1938 (*La Relève* fév. 33-7). CLAUDE HURTUBISE, Ghéon devant Mozart (*La Relève* oct. 186-9). GUSTAVE LAMARCHE, La symbolique du détachement dans l'œuvre de Claudel (*Le Séminaire* mars 46-52). GABRIEL-M. LUSSIER, Verts pâturages (*RD* mars 140). JEAN-MARIE PARENT, Henri Ghéon, le comédien de la grâce (*La Relève* oct. 170-4). MARCEL RAYMOND, Henri Ghéon et André Gide (*La Relève* oct. 175-8).

See also I C.

D. Writings on Religion

Activités hospitalières des Soeurs de Charité de la Providence (au Canada et en pays de missions). Montréal, Providence Maison-Mère, rue Fullum, 117pp. Almanach de l'Action sociale catholique. 22e année. Québec, Action sociale catholique, 100pp., 50c. Almanach de Saint François, 1938. Montréal, Librairie Saint-François, 80pp. **Archambault** (le R. P.), L'Action catholique d'après les directives pontificales. Montréal, Ecole sociale populaire, 156pp., 50c. Revd. *CFran.* déc.; *RD* mars. L'Atelier fermé et la doctrine sociale de l'église, par un groupe de théologiens. Québec, Action catholique, 33pp., 10c. **Audet (Lionel)**, Notre participation au sacerdoce du Christ: Étude sur le caractère sacramentel. Québec, Université Laval, 63pp., 35c. **Bellemare (Albert)**, Combat missionnaire. (Tract no. 17.) Montréal, Ligue missionnaire des étudiants, 19pp. **Bellouard (M.-A.)**, Admirables, maladroites, malfaisantes (215pp., 60c.); Des choses qui font penser (169pp., 50c.; revd. *RD* avril). Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier. **Bergeron (René)**, Tim et Jos: Au

cimetière des objections. (L'Apostolat populaire, no. 15.) Montréal, chez l'auteur, 4223a rue Hochelaga, 16pp., 5c. **Bernier (Paul)**, Célébration de la sainte messe en la nuit de Noël. En appendice: Relevé bibliographique des livres, opuscules et articles publiés par le clergé de Québec au cours de l'année 1938 (Québec, Action catholique, 22pp., 30c.); De l'amotion des curés amovibles et inamovibles. En appendice: Relevé bibliographique des livres, opuscules et articles publiés par le Clergé de Québec au cours de l'année 1937 (19pp., 25c.); De patrimonio parœciali: Dissertatio ad lauream in jure canonico consequendam exhibita A. D. MCMXXXV (viii, 162pp., $1.50; revd. *CFran.* fév., 1939); Le droit canonique de la visite pastorale (22pp., 25c.). Québec, chez l'auteur, rue Part-Dauphin. **Bourque (Emmanuel)**, Cérémonie des enfants de chœur. Québec, Edns. de la Commission diocésaine des cérémonies, 1937, 415pp., 50c. Le Canada ecclésiastique: Annuaire du clergé, 1938. Cinquante-deuxième année. Montréal, Beauchemin, 1144pp., $2.20. **Carrier (Joseph)**, Synopsis du catéchisme de Québec, Montréal et Ottawa. Saint-Bruno, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 80pp., 75c. **Charland (Raymond-M.)**, L'index: Nos problèmes. Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 192pp., 55c. Revd. *CFran.* mai.; *NC* no. 2; *RD* mars; *RUO* janv.-mars, 1939. ***Conway (B. L.)**, La boîte aux questions: Réponses de Dieu aux inquiétudes de l'homme. Traduction et adaptation par ADRIEN MALO. Préface de GEORGES GAUTHIER. Montréal, Beauchemin, x, 451pp. Revd. *AU* fév.; *NC* mars. **Couture (Hyacinthe)**, Méditations mariales. Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 143pp., 25c. **Desrochers (Bruno)**, Cérémonial de la visite pastorale: Avec un chapitre préliminaire sur le droit canonique de la visite pastorale, par Mgr P. BERNIER (80pp., 60c.); Cérémonial des ministres sacrés (325pp.). Québec, Commission diocésaine des cérémonies liturgiques. L'Ecole sociale populaire. No. 288. Le problème rural au regard de la doctrine sociale de l'église: Lettre pastorale collective de l'épiscopat de la province civile de Québec; No. 294. le R. P. ARCHAMBAULT, L'Action catholique et les religieuses; No. 299. Le cardinal JEAN-MARIE-RODRIGUE VILLENEUVE et les archevêques et évêques de la province de Québec, La tempérance. Montréal, Action paroissiale, 32pp. each; 15c. each. **Germain (Victorin)**, Catéchèse des 6e et 9e commandements de Dieu: Complément du catéchisme officiel. Québec, Action catholique, 196pp. **Gilles (Frère)**. *See* GOSSELIN, NOËL. **Gosselin (Noël)** (Frère GILLES *pseud.*), Homelies: Pour le coin du feu. Montréal, Librairie Saint-François, 111pp. **Granger (Arthur M.)**, L'amour qui . . . Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 1937, 90pp., 25c. (out of print). **Juneau (Roméo)** éd., Martyrs aux glaces polaires: La meilleure composition dans chaque genre du Concours Rouvière et Leroux. Chambly-Bassin, P.Q., Edns. de l'Apostolat des O.M.I., 225pp., 60c. Contains: JOSEPH-ALBERT TREMBLAY, Les deux vengeances, Drame historique; PIERRE DE GRANDPRÉ, Un drame chez les Innoîts, Récit du martyre des pères Rouvière et Le Roux; ARMAND LAJEUNESSE, Martyrs du gel et de l'acier, Radio-drame; RICHARD JOLY, Martyrs, Récit en prose rythmée; PAUL LEVESQUE, Martyre des Pères Rouvière et Le Roux, Dissertation. **Lajat (Félix-M.)**, Le lazaret de Tracadie et la communauté des Religieuses Hospitalières de Saint-Joseph. Montréal, Action paroissiale, 434pp., $1.50. **Lambert (Emile)**, Nouveaux propos oratoires. Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 245pp., $1.00. **Langlois (Arthur W.)**, Le premier légat canadien. Montréal, 3444 rue St. Denis, 79pp., 50c. **Latour (Conrad)**, Le cantique liturgique (16pp., 5c.); Chants populaires pour les missions et les retraites, heures saintes, etc. (64pp.). Ottawa, Edns. de l'Université. **Laurendeau (André)**, L'Actualité de S. François. Introd. par ROMAIN LEGARÉ. Montréal, Edns. des Amis de Saint François, 39pp., 10c. **Longpré (Anselme)**, La folie de la croix. Saint-Hyacinthe, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 158pp. Revd. *Le Séminaire* août. **Meunier (Ovila-A.)**, Le curé dans la hiérarchie de l'Action catholique. Trois-Rivières, Impr. Saint-Joseph, 114pp. Revd. *RUO* avril-juin 1939. Nos prières et cantiques. Laprairie, P.Q., Impr. du Sacré-Cœur, 243pp. Revd. *Le Séminaire* août. L'Œuvre des tracts. No. 225. AUGUSTE GRONDIN, Congrès eucharistique national de Québec, 22-26 juin, 1938; No. 229. CHARLES DUBÉ, La vierge en Nouvelle-France. Montréal, Action paroissiale, 16pp. each; 10c. each. **Pâquet (Louis-Adolphe)**, Au soir de la vie: Modestes pages philosophico-

religieuses (Québec, Impr. Franciscaine Missionnaire, 309pp.); Le rôle primordial de la fin (Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 30pp., 10c.; revd. *CFran.* juin; *RD* juin). **Rancourt** (**Jules**) éd., Chants religieux pour la célébration du mariage. Québec, Action catholique, viii, 46pp., $1.50. **Savignac** (**Ernest**), Ordo de la Congrégation des Hommes de Ville-Marie, avec coutumier, catalogue et nécrologie. Montréal, Impr. Sylvain, 16pp. Société S.-Jean-Baptiste de Montréal. Programme-souvenir de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste, 24 juin, 1938. Montréal, La Société, 100pp. Théologie, Cahier I. (Etudes et Recherches, publiées par le Collège Dominicain d'Ottawa, II.) Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 1937, 211pp. Revd. *CF* janv. 1939. **Viau** (**Stanislas-M.**), Pour sauver ce qui était perdu. Ottawa, Edns. du Lévrier, 84pp., épuisé. Revd. *RD* août. **Villeneuve** (Cardinal **Jean-Marie-Rodrigue**), Les divines écritures: Instructions d'avent à la basilique de Québec (Québec, Librairie de l'Action catholique, 79pp., 35c.); La messe. (Québec, Edns. de l'Action catholique, 215pp., 65c.; revd. *RD* oct.); Quelques pierres de doctrine (Montréal, Beauchemin; Ottawa, Edns. de l'Université, 224pp., $1.00). **Yelle** (**Emile**), Mes ordinations. Montréal, Granger, 315pp., 75c. Revd. *RD* oct.; *Le Séminaire* août. **Yelle** (**Gérard**), Le mystère de la sainteté du Christ selon le Cardinal Pierre de Berulle. ("Theologica Montis Regii:" Publications de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Montréal, I.) Montréal, Granger, 146pp., $1.00. Revd. *CFran.* déc.; *Le Séminaire* nov.

Marcel Bélanger, Le Christ-Chef dans les épitres de saint Paul (*RUO* janv.-mars 5*-15*; oct.-déc. 221*-42*). Gabriel Breynat, Saint Joseph, père vierge de Jésus (*RUO* avril-juin 81*-111*). Georges Bugnet, Ivan et Fédor (*CFran.* oct. 166-84). André-Emile Dubois, Les "institutions" dans la chrétienté nouvelle (*Carnets du théologue* juin 85-97). Emile Jetté, Les âmes dans la chrétienté nouvelle (*Carnets du théologue* avril 41-8). Jean L'Helgouac'h, Le don de force (*RUO* juillet-sept. 349-58). Eugène L'Heureux, L'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec (*La Société canadienne d'histoire de l'église catholique rapport* 1936-7, 31-4). Ovila Meunier, Le curé dans la hiérarchie de l'action catholique (*RUO* oct.-déc. 409-41), La hiérarchie catholique et la politique (*RUO* juillet-sept. 292-313). M.-Albert O'Neill, Sur la philosophie chrétienne (*NC* août 297-306). Séverin Pelletier, Religion, personne et ordre social (*RUO* janv.-mars 62-78). Léandre Poirier, La musique pour ma prière (*NC* no. 2, 158-70). Edgar Thivierge, A la naissance du diocèse d'Ottawa (suite) (*RUO* janv.-mars 6-30). Richard Tremblay, La messe et nous (*RD* janv. 24-32). Raymond Voyer, Le problème religieux du médecin (*L'Hôpital* janv.).

E. Writings on Education

A la mémoire de Mère Sainte-Anne-Marie maîtresse générale des études de la Congrégation de Notre Dame, fondatrice du Collège Marguerite Bourgeoys et de l'Institut pédagogique. Souvenir offert en hommage à Mère Sainte-Anne-d'Auray supérieure de l'Institut pédagogique à l'occasion du 50e anniversaire de sa profession religieuse 1888-1938. Montréal, Arbour et Dupont, 198pp. **[Bonin** (**R.**)], Expédition Scoute au Saguenay. Troupe Notre-Dame de Montréal. Montréal, Paul Leclaire, 14pp. (out of print). **Corbeil** (**Sylvio**), Pédagogie du jeune humaniste canadien. Montréal, Beauchemin, 223pp., $1.00. **Groulx** (**Lionel**), Une croisade d'adolescents. Ed. nouvelle (Montréal, Granger, 200pp., 50c.); Faites-nous des hommes: Préparations des jeunes à leurs tâches prochaines (Montréal, Edns. de la Jeunesse Indépendante catholique, 32pp., 10c.). **Lasalle** (**Hugo**), Une université catholique au Japon. (L'Œuvre des tracts, no. 232.) Montréal, Action paroissiale, 16pp., 10c. **Plante** (**Albert**), Vingt-cinq ans de vie française: Le Collège de Sudbury. Montréal, 152pp., 50c. Revd. *Carnets du théologue* janv. 1939. **Roy** (**Camille**), Générations solidaires: Allocution prononcée au banquet de clôture de la journée universitaire, lundi soir, 7 février 1938 (Québec, Action catholique, 7pp.); L'Université Laval, son œuvre, ses besoins: Causerie à la radio, poste CKCV, Québec, le 5 déc.,

1938 (Québec, L'Université Laval, 11pp.). Le vrai visage du scoutisme. Montréal, L'Œuvre de Presse dominicaine, 160pp., 50c.

GEORGES-ETIENNE BERARD, La renaissance terrienne et la réforme scolaire (*Carnets du théologue* avril 62-70). RAOUL BLANCHARD, Enquête d'histoire locale (*L'enseignement secondaire au Canada* XVII, 334-40). ROCH BOUGIE et JEAN-PAUL BOLDUC, La renaissance terrienne et les devoirs des littérateurs (*Carnets du théologue* avril 57-61). EMILE CHARTIER, Equivalences universitaires (*AU* déc. 5-7), La Faculté des Arts à Montréal (*Le Devoir* 17 nov.), Isocrate à Démonicos (éloge de la vertu) (*Enseignement secondaire au Canada* nov. 5-9), et MARIUS SOFFRAY, Relative et relatif en grec (*Enseignement secondaire au Canada* janv.-mai). HECTOR COTÉ, L'ennui au collège (*Carnets du théologue* juin 108-12). M.-ALCANTARA DION, Scoutisme et Action catholique (*RD* juillet 3-20). M.-CESLAS FOREST, Les dimensions du scoutisme (*RD* nov. 173-85), Le haut savoir (*RD* mars 133). RENÉ GUENETTE, Français du Canada et Français de France (*L'Ecole canadienne* no. 2, 49), Le problème de l'autorité (*L'Ecole canadienne* nov. 99), Le sens de la vie (*L'Ecole canadienne* nov. 97). CHRYSOSTOME LAUZON, Une école de formation rurale à Saint-Pie-de-Guire (*Le Mauricien* août 14). MAURICE LEBEL, A propos d'anglais (*L'Enseignement secondaire au Canada* déc. 1937; janv.), Pour que nos élèves lisent mieux (*L'Enseignement secondaire au Canada* mai). LÉON LORTIE, Les lettres de J.-B. Meilleur sur l'éducation en 1838 (*RTC* sept. 251-71). IRÉNÉE LUSSIER, Nos classes auxiliaires (*L'Ecole canadienne*, XIV année (1), 12). J.-E.-A. MARCOTTE, La désobéissance (*L'Ecole canadienne* nov. 101). OLIVIER MAURAULT, L'enseignement supérieur au Canada français (*RTC* sept. 225-38). CLAUDE MÉLANÇON, Nature et scoutisme (*RD* avril 173-80). JULIEN PEGHAIRE, Dissertations philosophiques corrigées (*Revue de l'enseignement secondaire au Canada* janv., fév., nov., déc.). GONZALVE POULIN, La culture populaire et les loisirs (*NC* no. 2, 141-57; août 277-96; déc. 375-419). Les premières écoles du soir à Québec (*BRH* déc. 374-5). A. SAINT-PIERRE, Le scoutisme et la culture (*RD* mai 230-42). GEORGES SIMARD, Les universités catholiques (*RUO* juillet-sept. 364-70). RAYMOND TANGHE, La portée sociale du scoutisme (*RD* juin 295-305). J.-B. VINET, Le Collège de Montréal (*AU* nov. 5-7, 14). RAYMOND-M. VOYER, Les grandes lois de la psychologie scoute (*RD* mars 117-32). ARMAND YON, Un éducateur canadien: L'abbé Verreau (1828-1901) (*RTC* juin 144-57).

Selected List of Text-books, etc.

Audet (Mme **Jean-Louis**), Les monologues du petit-monde: Avec commentaires, quelques éléments de phonétique et le cours des moyens. Illustrations de MARIE-LAURE CABANA. Montréal, Beauchemin, 253pp. Revd. *RD* oct. **Bleau** (**J. M. A.**), Abrégé de minéralogie: Extrait de La minéralogie du prospecteur. A l'usage des écoles normales, collèges classiques, des classes de 9e, 10e et 11e années des écoles primaires supérieures. Montréal, Imprimerie De Lasalle, 67pp. **Bourgoin** (**Louis**), Cours de chimie: Métaux. Montréal, Ecole polytechnique, 1937, 688pp., $4.00. **Deschamps** (**Philippe**), La composition française, manuel pour l'enseignement primaire-supérieur et secondaire. Montréal, Les clercs de Saint-Viateur, 1937, 275pp., $1.25. Revd. *CFran.* janv. 1939. L'Economie domestique à l'École normale. 1e, 2e, 3e, 4e années. St-Pascal de Kamouraska, P.Q., Institution Chanoine Beaudet, 345pp., $1.00. **Gagne** (**J. Adrien**), Traité élémentaire de chimie. Québec, Action catholique, 502pp., $1.50. Manuel d'enseignement rural. Par les Frères Maristes. Cours primaire élémentaire. 3e et 4e années. Montréal, Granger, 320pp., 75c.

F. Comment on Current Affairs

L'Ecole sociale populaire. Nos. 289-90. RICHARD ARÈS, Catéchisme de l'organisation corporative (64pp., 25c.); No. 292. JEAN FILION, Jeunesse et politique (32pp.); No. 295. RICHARD ARÈS, Petit catéchisme d'éducation syndicale (32pp.); No. 296. OLIVAR ASSELIN, L'Industrie dans l'économie du Canada

français (32pp.); No. 297. Mgr DESRANLEAU et le cardinal JEAN-MARIE-RODRIGUE VILLENEUVE, Pour un ordre nouveau, Allocutions prononcées à la Semaine sociale de Sherbrooke le 25 et le 27 septembre 1938 (32pp.); No. 298. JOHN T. MCNICHOLAS, Mentalité communiste. En appendice: Tentatives du communisme au Canada (32pp.). Montréal, Action paroissiale, 15c. each. **Gagner (Joseph-Léopold)**, J'ai vu les communistes à Montréal. Montréal, 36pp., 10c. **Gosselin (Paul Emile)**, Destin de race. Québec, Action catholique, 20pp., 10c. **[Grignon (C.-H.)]**, Les pamphlets de Valdombre. *See* V C. **Lamarche (Thomas-M.)**, A qui le pouvoir? A qui l'argent?: Corporatisme, crédit-travail. Montréal, Presse dominicaine, 240pp., 75c. **Laureys (Henry)**, Le Canada et la crise. (Congrès des Nations américaines, organisé sous le patronage de l'Université de Paris et du Comité France-Amérique par l'Institut des Etudes Américaines.) Paris, Institut des Etudes Américaines, 14pp., 2 frs. **Lebon (Wilfrid)**, La nationalisation des entreprises. Montréal, Ecole sociale populaire, 32pp., 15c. On demande des chefs: Problèmes de rayonnement. Montréal, Edns. de l'A.C.J.C., 1937, 156pp., 50c. L'Œuvre des tracts: No. 223. ROGER BROSSARD, L'Impérieuse mission de la jeunesse; No. 226. GEORGES GAUTHIER, Lettre sur le communisme; No. 228. Mémoires des minorités catholiques de langue française au Canada presentés à la Commission Rowell, Acadiens et Canadiens français des Provinces Maritimes, Canadiens français du Manitoba, Canadiens français de la Saskatchewan, Canadiens français de l'Alberta; No. 230. Congrés mondial de la jeunesse; No. 231. CAMILLE POISSON, Doit-on tolérer la propagande communiste?; No. 233. Le front unique: Piège communiste. Montréal, Action paroissiale, 16pp. each; 10c. each. **Sauvé (Gustave)**, Autorité ou révolution. Ottawa, Edns. de l'Université, 31pp. **Savignac (Ernest)**, La colonie de vacances des grèves. Vingt-sixième rapport annuel, 1937. Montréal, Impr. Sylvain, 16pp. Semaines sociales du Canada, XVIe session, Sherbrooke, 1938. Pour une société chrétienne. Montréal, Secrétariat des Semaines sociales du Canada, Ecole sociale populaire, 416pp., $1.50. Contains discussions by: HERMAS BASTIEN, HENRI SIMARD, JEAN-J. PENVERNE, R. P. LEVASSEUR, LÉON LEBEL, GONZALVE POULIN, ARSENE GOYETTE, DOM CRENIER, ESDRAS MINVILLE, EUGÈNE TREMBLAY, GEORGES-EMILE LADOUCEUR, GÉRARD PICARD, PHILIPPE PERRIER, GEORGES-HENRI GUIMONT, J.-D. DUFOUR, WILFRID LEBON, MAXIMILIEN CARON, GEORGES-HENRI LÉVESQUE. **Simard (O.-D.)**, La femme et le foyer: Causerie donnée à la radio en décembre 1937. Chicoutimi, P.Q., Impr. le Progrès du Saguenay, [iv], 26pp., 10c. **Truchy (Henri)**, La crise des échanges internationaux: Conférences données à l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montréal, du 7 février au 4 mars 1938. Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 189pp. **Vaillancourt (Emile)**, La France peut être heureuse sans Québec. Montréal, G. Ducharme, 12pp. **Viatte (Auguste)**, La guerre de Chine. Paris, Edns. du Cerf, 50pp., 3.75 frs. **Villeneuve** (Cardinal, **Jean-Marie-Rodrigue)**, Le fait français en Amérique. Conférence donnée à Boston le 4 mai 1938 devant la Société historique franco-américaine (Québec, Action catholique, 32pp., 10c.); Liberté et libertés: Conférence donnée au Cercle universitaire de Montréal, le 29 janvier, 1937 (Collection "Le Document," no. 30; Montréal, l'Impr. populaire ltée, 29pp., 10c.).

MAURICE D'AUTEUIL, Pour une politique extérieure canadienne (*RUO* juillet-sept. 314-26). VICTOR BARBEAU, Le désordre à corriger (*Action nationale* XI (1) 26), Organisation professionnelle (*AU* mai 170, 172-3, 175, 177). JOSEPH BAUDOUIN, Notre bilan-vie: Essai d'étude sur le capital humain de la province de Québec (*AU* oct. 6-8). WILFRID BOVEY, Sauvegardons la démocratie dans le Québec (*Le Mauricien* mars 7, 28, 30). GEORGES BUGNET, Pour l'esprit canadien (*Les Idées* janv.). MAXIMILIEN CARON, L'organisation corporative et la constitution canadienne (*L'Action nationale* mars). J.-B. DESROSIERS, Principes et description de l'organisation corporative (*L'Action Nationale* fév. 143). EMILE-CHARLES HAMEL, articles on international politics and literary criticism (*Le Jour*). JEAN-CHARLES HARVEY, articles on politics, education, literature, etc. (*Le Jour*). CHARLES-D. HERISSON, La lutte des intérêts et des idées aux Etats-Unis (*CFran.* janv. 497-523), Nouveaux

aspects de la vie politique aux Etats-Unis (*CFran.* nov. 250-68). P.-B. MIGNAULT, Nos problèmes constitutionnels (*Revue du droit* XVI (10) 577). J. F. PARKINSON, La Banque du Canada (*Annuaire des Banques d'Emission*, Geneva, 307-21). ROLAND PRÉVOST, La confédération—le pour et le contre (*Revue populaire* juillet 5). CHARLES SAURIOL, Le retour à la terre: Une coopérative de colonisation qui réussit à merveille (*Revue populaire* oct. 7-8, 63). AUGUSTE VIATTE, L'Italie et la politique européenne (*CFran.* juin 1087-94), Les lendemains de la guerre civile espagnole (*CFran.* mai 908-16), Le pangermanisme et l'Europe centrale (*CFran.* avril 799-808), Rome-Berlin-Tokio (*CFran.* janv. 455-62), La tragédie d'Europe centrale (*CFran.* déc. 315-24), Les vicissitudes de l'accord franco-russe (*CFran.* mars 707-13).

VI. SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HUMANITIES

A. Canadian Fields

Annales de l'ACFAS. Tome. 4. Montréal, Association canadienne-française pour l'Avancement des Sciences, 359pp. **Blanchard (Raoul)**, Etudes canadiennes (deuxième série). III: Les Laurentides. (Extrait de la "Revue de géographie alpine" publiée sous la direction de RAOUL BLANCHARD et MAURICE PARDÉ, vol. XXXVI, 1938, fasc. 1.) Grenoble, Allier père et fils, 183pp. Les cahiers des Dix. Tome III. Drummondville, P.Q., La Parole, 325pp. Contains: VICTOR MORIN, Les Ramezay et leur château; OLIVIER MAURAULT, L'Ecole française de Berthier; P.-G. ROY, La bande de Chambers; A. FAUTEUX, Montcalm et "l'Ami des hommes;" E.-Z. MASSICOTTE, Evocations du vieux Montréal; MONTARVILLE BOUCHER DE LA BRUÈRE, Pierre Boucher colonisateur; F.-J. AUDET, Les Mondelet; A. TESSIER, Deux enrichis, Aaron Hart et Nicolas Montour; A. BEAUGRAND-CHAMPAGNE, Sur le peuplement de l'Amérique du Nord; G. MALCHELOSSE, Niort de la Noraye. Revd. *C Historical Review* March 1939; *Le Devoir* janv. 17, 1939. **Corminbœuf (Fernand)**, Retrospective . . . ou le Canada avant l'histoire. Préface du R. F. MARIE-VICTORIN. (Documents scientifiques.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 109pp., 75c. **Duchein (F.)**, Directoire du saint prêtre. Préface de GEORGES GAUTHIER. Tomes I et II. (Collection "Le Séminaire," 2, 3.) 2ème éd. Montréal, Granger, 391, 395pp., $2.00 (2 vols.). Etudes économiques: Thèses presentées à la "Licence en Sciences commerciales" en mai 1937. (Publications de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montréal.) Tome VII. Montréal, Beauchemin, 1937, 453pp., $5.00. **Filteau (Gérard)**, Histoire des patriotes. Tome I: L'explosion du nationalisme. (Documents historiques.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 227pp. Revd. *AU* oct. **Lemay (Hugolin)**, Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin, récollet: Les pièces documentaires. Montréal, chez l'auteur, 2010 W. Dorchester St., 1937, xxx, 239pp. Revd. *NC* août. **Martineau (Jean Chrysostome)**, Code de procédure civile de la Province de Québec, 1938. Montreal, Wilson & Lafleur, $4.50. **Montpetit (Edouard)**, La conquête économique. Tome I: Les forces essentielles. Montréal, Edns. Bernard Valiquette, 292pp., $1.00. Revd *RD* déc. **Provost (Alp.)** comp., Les grèves de Sorel. Tome I. Montréal, 253pp., $1.00. **Routier (René)**, La famille Routier: Dispersée en Amérique du Nord depuis trois cents ans. Notes généalogiques collectionnées. 1ère édn. St. Adrien d'Irlande, P.Q., chez l'auteur, 1937, [iii], 29pp. (miméo.). **Roy (Pierre-Georges)**, La famille de Rigaud de Vaudreuil (Québec, chez l'auteur, Archives de la province, 216pp.); Inventaire des contrats de mariage du régime français conservés aux Archives judiciaires de Québec (6 vols.; Québec, Palais de Justice, vols. I-III, 1937; IV-VI, 1938, 300, 300, 300, 300, 300, 292pp.); Rapport de l'archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938 (Québec, King's Printer, VI, 383pp.). Société Royale du Canada, Mémoires de la. Littérature, histoire, archéologie, sociologie, économie politique, et sujets connexes, en français. Troisième série, tome XXXI, sect. I, séance de mai 1937; tome XXXII, sect. I, séance de mai 1938. **Towner (J. A.)**, Vérification municipale et scolaire. (Documents économiques.) Montréal, Edns. de l'A. C.-F., 1937, 295pp., $5.00.

ELIE-J. AUCLAIR, L'Ecole Victoria de Montréal (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 1-20), La région de Soulanges et son canal (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 35-50). G. BOUCHARD, Rodolphe Lemieux (*Royal Society of Canada Proceedings* 86-92). CHARLES BOURGEOIS, Un conflit juridico-ecclésiastique (*RUO* avril-juin 166-83). IVANHOË CARON, Inventaire de la correspondance de Mgr Joseph Signay, deuxième archevêque de Québec (*Rapport de l'archiviste de la province de Québec pour 1937-38*, 23-146), Monseigneur Joseph-Octave Plessis, curé de Notre-Dame de Québec (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 21-40), Monseigneur Joseph-Octave Plessis: Sa famille (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 97-117). GÉRARD GARDNER, Terre-Neuve, île étrange (*L'Actualité économique* déc. 101-15). GEORGES LANGLOIS, Essai sur le peuplement français au Canada (Congrès international de la population, Paris, Hermann et cie., 1937, II, 49-60). HUGOLIN LEMAY, Etude bibliographique et historique sur La Morale pratique du jansénisme du P. Louis Hennepin, récollet (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 127-49), Le père Louis Hennepin récollet à Paris 1682 (*NC* no. 2, 105-40), Le père Louis Hennepin récollet devant l'histoire (*NC* août 245-76; déc., 341-74), Le père Louis Hennepin, récollet, devant Rome (*NC* mars 17-68). OLIVIER MAURAULT, Adélard Boucher (1835-1912) (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 85-97), VICTOR MORIN, Esquisse biographique de Jacques Viger (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 183-90). L. A. PRUD'HOMME, Les premiers Aborigènes du Manitoba et les Mandans (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 165-74). THIBAUDEAU RINFRET, Le droit civil de la province de Québec et le droit naturel tel qu'exposé par Saint Thomas (*RUO* avril-juin 112*-27*). GEORGES ROBITAILLE, Marie de l'Incarnation: D'Après la deuxième partie de sa correspondance (*Mém. SRC* XXXII, 115-32). E. FABRE SURVEYER, Charles-Ovide Perrault (1809-1837) (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 151-64). ARTHUR VALLÉE, La Duchesse d'Aiguillon, fondatrice de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec (*Mém. SRC* XXXI, 1937, 65-73). FERNAND DE VERNEUIL, Le Canada: Berceau du monde (*Revue populaire* mai 10-11).

See I B (T. HUDON, J. MICHEL, A.-G. MORICE); I D (E. DIX, O. MAURAULT, J. ROCHEFORT); *BRH* with writers noted: C. de BONNAULT, A. FAUTEUX, J.-H. FOURNIER, G. GARDNER, F.-X. GRONDIN, O.-M. JOUVE, H. LEMAY, E.-Z. MASSICOTTE, M. NANTEL, L. POULIOT, P.-G. ROY.

B. Other Fields

(a) Philosophy and General Science

L'Académie canadienne Saint-Thomas d'Aquin, septième session, 7 et 8 octobre 1936. Québec, Action catholique, 227pp. **Bovy (Lambert)**, Grâce et liberté chez Saint Augustin: Extrait de la dissertation présentée à la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Montréal, le 21 septembre 1937. Montréal, Beauchemin, Granger, 124pp., 75c. Revd. *CFran.* oct.; *Enseignement secondaire du Canada* janv. 1939; *Le Séminaire* nov. **Charland (Thomas M.)**, Les artes praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au moyen âge. (Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa, pub. 7.) Ottawa, l'Institut, 1937, 450pp., $3.00. **Ferland (Auguste)**, Commentarius in summam D. Thomae: De gratia et de sacramentis in communi. Préface par Cardinal J.-M.-R. VILLENEUVE. Montréal, Grand Séminaire, xxii, 510pp. Revd. *CFran.* juin; *RUO* janv.-mars 1939. **Filion (Emile)**, Elementa philosophiae thomisticae. Tomus secundus: Theodicea, psychologia, critica. Montréal, Beauchemin, xii, 601pp. Revd. *AU* sept.; *RUO* juillet-sept. **Grenier (Henri)**, Cursus philosophiæ. Volumen tertium continens Philosophiam moralem. Québec, L'Action sociale ltée, 351pp. **Léry (Louis Chaussegros de)**, Le privilège de la foi. Studia Collegii Maximi Immaculatae Conceptionis. Fasciculus III. Montréal, Collège de l'Immaculée Conception, xiv, 171pp., $1.50. **Longpré (Ephrem)**, S. Bernardin de Sienne et le Nom de Jésus. Quaracchi-Firenze, Italie, Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1937, 118pp., 50 lire. **Parent (J. M.)**, La doctrine de la création dans l'Ecole de Chartres. (Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa, Pub. VIII.) Ottawa, l'Institut, 220pp.

Emile Baas, Erasme et notre inquiétude (*La Relève* janv. 12-16). Georges Bugnet, Science et foi (*CFran.* juin 1059-67). Edmond Buron, Elan et repos, variations sur l'idée de rythme (*Revue de synthèse* avril 15-28). Rodolphe Dubé (François Hertel *pseud.*), D'une civilisation personnaliste (*Action nationale* mars 205-28), Position du personnalisme (*Action nationale* fév., 95-116). Joseph Ferland, Le prix d'une vie (*CFran.* mai 923-35). M.-A. Lamarche, Le père Labat ou l'humour d'un savant (1664-1738) (*RD* sept. 73-88; oct. 133-43). Ephrem Longpré, Robert Grossetête et Duns Scot: Le motif de l'incarnation (*La France franciscaine* juillet-sept. 1-16). Léon Lortie, "Le message scientifique de Descartes" (*AU* janv., fév.). Gérard Morin, Une fleur du génie: Essai sur la simplicité (*CFran.* juin 1068-86). Julien Peghaire, Un thomiste devant Descartes (*RUO* janv.-mars 29*-59*). Louis-M. Régis, Saint Thomas révolutionnaire (*RD* mars 113). Henri Saint-Denis, La révolution rationaliste au dix-huitième siècle (read at the annual meeting of the C Catholic Historical Association, held in Toronto, Oct. 20, 1937) (*RUO* oct.-déc. 470-4).

(b) Social Sciences

Beaulieu (Marie Louise), Du bornage et de l'action en bornage. Montréal, Wilson et Lafleur, 1937, $6.00. **Blanchard (Raoul)**, Les Alpes occidentales. Tome I: Les préalpes françaises du nord (Tours, Arrault, 335pp.); Géographie générale. Tome I (Montréal, Beauchemin, 208pp.). **Lebel (Léon)**, La famille dans le régime économique moderne. Montréal, Union catholique des cultivateurs, 515 ave. Viger, 26pp.

Raoul Blanchard, Les Méditerranéens à Grenoble (*Mélanges de géographie et d'orientalisme offerts à E. F. Gautier*, Tours, Arrault, 52-4). Lambert Bovy, Le syndicat des fonctionnaires municipaux (*La vie syndicale* mars). Arthur Caron, Les droits de la civilisation et l'occupation des terres non-civilisées (*RUO* juillet-sept. 165*-82*). Jean-Marie Gauvreau, L'artisanat (*AU* mars 125-6). Père Louis-Marie, Les mécanismes de l'hérédité (*RUO* oct.-déc. 442-55). A. Saint-Pierre, Le problème social: Un élément de solution (*RD* déc. 235-42). Raymond Tanghe, Pour une morale du travail (*CFran.* sept. 5-21).

VII. HANDBOOKS AND COMPILATIONS

Almanach du peuple Beauchemin, 1938. 69e année. Montréal, Beauchemin, 480pp., 35c. **Gendron (Rodolphe)**, Harmonie des couleurs pour les commençants. Ottawa, Edns. de l'Université, 12pp. Revd. *RUO* avril-juin. **King (William)**, Principes de la fabrication du coton. Montreal, Dominion Textile Co., 200pp., $1.00. **Normandeau (Lucien)**, Lexique de mécanique d'ajustage. Préface de Hector-F. Beaupré. Montréal, Edns. de "Technique," xii, 255pp. Religieuses de Saint-Joseph à l'Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal: La diététique, rédigé en collaboration. Montréal, Religieuses de Saint-Joseph, 1937, 308pp. **Turcot (Conrad)**, La culture du tabac jaune dans la province de Québec. La Trappe, P.Q., L'Institut Agricole d'Oka, 52pp. Revd. *AU* avril.

LISTS OF PUBLICATIONS

NEW-CANADIAN[1]

Compiled by Watson Kirkconnell

I. SELECTED PERIODICALS[2]

(*Supplement to list printed in "Letters in Canada, 1937"*)

Buduchnist Natsiyi ("Future of the Nation"), Yorkton, Sask. [Ukr. Catholic; weekly; 1933+]. BN. **Hollandia,** Chatham, Ont. [Dutch; monthly; 1937+]. H. **L'Italia Nuova,** Montreal, 1410 Stanley St. [Ital.; weekly; 1916+; replaces both *L'Italia* and *L'Araldo del Canada*]. IN. **Kanadsky Gudok,** Winnipeg, 209 Jarvis Ave. [Russian; tri-weekly; 1931+]. KG. **Ukrayinsky Robitnyk** ("Ukrainian Toiler"), Toronto, 510 King St. West [Ukr.; weekly; 1934+; ed. Michael Hethman]. UR.

L'Araldo del Canada, Danebrog, L'Italia, and *Jewish Post* have been discontinued.

II. CULTURAL AND LITERARY HISTORY OF CANADA

A. Selected Studies in Historical and Contemporary Background

Fast (M. B.), Das Familienleben der Mennoniten einst und jetzt (Ger. "Family life of Mennonites formerly and now;" serially in *MR*). **Gibbon (John Murray),** Canadian mosaic: Making of a northern nation. Toronto, McClelland, xxviii, 455pp., $3.50. **Hurd (W. B.),** Racial origins and nativity of Canadian people, study based on census of 1931 and supplementary data. Ottawa, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, xviii, 292pp., 35c. **Martens (Franz W.),** Aus der mennonitischen Geschichte: Biographisch-geschichtliche Mitteilungen aus der Nikolaifelder Mennonitengemeinde auf Sagradowka, fuer das mennonitische Archiv in Canada (Ger. "From Mennonite history: Biographical and historical notes from Nikolaifeld Mennonite community at Sagradowka, for Mennonite archives in Canada;" serially in *Der Bote*). **Nowosad (Ivan),** Vesilni zvychayi, pisni, vivaty i kolomyky (Ukr. "Wedding customs, songs, games and dances;" serially in *UH*). **Thorsteinsson (T. T.),** Vestmenn ("Men of the West"). Reykjavík, Isalfoldarprentsmidja, 450pp.

Anna Arabska, Nasha molod v Kanadi (Ukr. "Our young people in Canada" *KF*). G. Arnason, Nokkur ord um landnámid í Alfavatns og Grunnavatnsbygd (Icel. "Some notes on settlements in Swan Lake and Shoal Lake districts" *TTI*). J. Bildfell, Fósturland vort (Icel. "Our native land" *Lög.*). Data on vital statistics of Italians in Canada, 1934 and 1935 (*Notiziario demográfico,* Rome, Feb. 33-5). L. Hamilton, Foreigners in Canadian West (*Dalhousie Review* Jan. 448-60). W. Kristjanson, Icelandic settlers in Canada (*Canadian Thinker* July-Aug. 8-16). J. A. Lenhard, German Catholics in Ontario (*Canadian Catholic Historical Association report* 1936-7, 41-5). Ivan Nagy, Hungarians in Canada (*Journal de la Société hongroise de statistique,* vol. 15 (1-2), 1937, 171-92). R. Pétursson, Thjodraeknisfjelagid 20 ára (Icel. "Twenty

[1]The language in which the work is written is indicated, and a translation of the title is supplied. All references in the lists are to 1938 except when another date is given.

[2]Abbreviation is given after entry. See also list in Letters in Canada, 1937. Additional abbreviations: *CP—Canada Posten; GK—Gazeta Katolicka; HG—Hrvatski Glas; KF—Kanadysky Farmer; KMU—Kanadai Magyar Ujsag; Ndw.—Nordwesten; Norr.—Norrona Canadian.*

years of National League" *TTI*). W. Sarchuk, Harmonizatsia dvokh kultur (Ukr. "Harmonizing of two cultures" *UH*). W. L. Scott, Catholic Ukrainian-Canadians (*Dublin Review* April 281-90).

B. Criticism of Canadian Literature and Speech

R. Beck, Jóhann Magnús Bjarnason, skáld aeskulyds og ungmenna (Icel. "J.M.B., poet of youth and young people" *Hkr.*), Skáldid Jón Runólfsson (Icel. "The poet, Jón Runólfsson" *TTI*). W. Kirkconnell, Literature of New-Canadians (Canadian literature today: Series of broadcasts sponsored by CBC; University of Toronto Press), New-Canadian letters in Letters in Canada (*University of Toronto Quarterly* July 567-71, 590-600). O. T. Lone *et al.*, Det norske sprogs Fremtid i Kanada (Nor. "Future of Norwegian language in Canada" *Norr.*). J. J. Norman, Thankar um Stephan G. Stephansson og ljódmæli hans (Icel. "Notes on S.G.S. and his poetry" *Lbg.*). T. J. Oleson, same subject and periodical.

C. Selected Publications in Arts and Crafts in Canada

H. Bjarnadóttir, Heimilisidnadur Islendinga í Vesturheimi (Icel. "Domestic arts of Icelanders in North America" *Hkr.*). G. H. Finnsdóttir, Vikivakar (Icel., old Icelandic folk-dances and poetry, *Hkr.*). G. Loewen, Ueber Harmonie, Musik, und Gesang (Ger. "On harmony, music, and song" *Warte*). S. Olafsson, Einar Jónsson myndhöggvari (Icel. "E. J., sculptor" *TTI*). Johann G. Rempel, Unsere Kirchenlieder (Ger. "Our hymns" series in *Der Bote*).

III. POETRY

Húnfjörd (Jóhannes H.), Omar, nokkur ljódmaeli af ymsum efnum og frá ymsum t mum (Icel. "Chimes, various poems on sundry subjects and from sundry occasions"). Winnipeg, Viking Press, 147pp. **Johnson (Jakobína)**, Kertaljós (Icel. "Candle-light"). Reykjavík, Isafoldarprentsmidja, 95pp. **Tulewitrow (Wasyl)**, Dumy i pisni (Ukr. "Musings and songs"). Toronto, Ukrainian Pub. Co., 100pp.

Poems by the following selected writers have appeared: **Croatian:** Josip Ivanov (*HG*), Stari Joza (*HG*), Barica Restek (*HG*), Janko Sudac (*HG*). **Dutch:** J. P. Heije (*Hollandia*), E. Kamps (*Hollandia*). **German:** Anna Baerg (*MR*), G. Berg (*Ndw.*), Neta Dyck (*Bote*), Neta Epp (*Bote*), Maria Feesche (*Bote*), H. D. Friesen (*MR*), Isaac P. Friesen (*Bundesbote, Ndw., MR, Zionsbote*), J. Hensen (*Ndw.*), David Hofer (*Ndw.*), Abr. Huebert (*MR*), Peter P. Isaac (*Bote, MR*), J. J. Jantzen (*MR*), J. H. Janzen (*Bote*), Peter J. Klassen (*Bote*), Georg Liebrecht (*Ndw.*), G. Loewen (*Bote, MW*), Ida Mengering (*Ndw.*), Joh. H. Neufeld (*MR*), F. C. Ortmann (*MR*), G. H. Peters (*MR*), Anton Pohlkamp (*Ndw.*), Emil Quandt (*MR*), G. D. Rempel (*MR*), P. P. Wiebe (*Ndw.*), F. E. Winger (*Ndw.*), Maria Zurowski (*Ndw.*). **Hungarian:** Izsak Gyula (*KMU*), István Karnay (*KMU*), Tibor Kovács (*KMU*), Vera Lya (*KMU*). **Icelandic:** A. B. (*Lbg.*), Magnús E. Anderson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Arnthor Arnason (*Hkr.*), Lárus Arnason (*Lbg.*), Richard Beck (*Hkr., Lbg., TTI*), S. B. Benedictsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), David Björnsson (*Hkr.*), S. E. Björnsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Hjörtur Brandson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), G. O. Einarsson (*Hkr.*), Magnús Einarsson (*Lbg.*), Gudm. Eliasson (*Lbg.*), E. G. Gillies (*Lbg.*), Hjálmar Gíslason (*Lbg.*), Páll Gudmundsson (*Lbg.*), S. Gunnlaugsson (*Hkr.*), Guttormur J. Guttormsson (*Hkr., Lbg., TTI*), Vigfús J. Guttormsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), F. Hjálmarsson (*Hkr.*), Bödvar frá Hnífsdal (*Lbg.*), B. Hornfjörd (*Lbg.*), Jóhannes H. Húnfjörd (*Hkr., Lbg.*), M. Ingimarsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Sigurdur Júlíus Jóhannesson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Erl. Johnson (*Lbg.*), Jakobína Johnson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Kristín D. Johnson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Kristian Johnson (*Lbg.*), Jón Jónatansson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Einar Páll Jónsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), J. S. frá Kaldbak (*Lbg.*), Jón Kernested (*Hkr., TTI*), Lúdvík Kristjánsson (*Hkr., Lbg.*), Magnús Markús-

SON (*Lbg.*), E. J. MELAN (*Hkr., Lbg.*), JAKOB J. NORMAN (*Lbg.*), PÁLL Á HJÁLMSSTÖDUM (*Lbg.*), KRISTJÁN S. PÁLSSON (*Hkr., Lbg.*), PÁLL S. PÁLSSON (*Hkr., Lbg.*), F. P. SIGURDSSON (*Hkr., Lbg.*), MARGRÉT J. SIGURDSSON (*Hkr.*), MAGNÚS I. THÓR (*Hkr.*), T. T. THORSTEINSSON (*Hkr.*), JÓHANNA S. THORWALD (*Hkr.*), STEFÁN VAGNSSON (*Lbg.*). **Italian:** LIBORIO LATTONI (*Il Bollettino, L'Italia Nuova*). **Norse:** (in *Norrona*): OLAV BÖHMER, MARTIN EIDE, M N. GRÖNDAL, MARTIN MYHRE, ALFRED C. MYKLE, SAM OVERLIE, SIMON OYEN, HEROLD PETTERSON, ANDERS MOE ROGNHAUG, MAGNUS STEIESTÖL, HANS WATNE. **Polish:** BRONISLAW KRÓL (*Czas*), JOZEF KWOKA (*Czas*), W. SIENKO (*Czas*), JOZEF STACH (*Gazeta Katolicka*), ANNA SWIRSZCZYNSKA (*Czas*); PIOTR WILGAN (*Czas*). **Swedish** (in *Canada Posten*): C. BERG, ERIK BJÖRKLUND, CARL BOBERG, NILS BOLANDER, JAKOB BONGGREN, O. BREDING, EMMA DREVITS, EDWARD EVERS, F. W. FABER, C. A. GAVERT, KNUT GUNER, F. O. GUSTAFSON, G. HJOBERG, CARL HOLMER, ALBERT JOHANSON, JOSEF LAGERGREN, CARL LINDOFF, OSCAR LÖVGREN, MANNE MALM, O. H. MILLER, VIKTOR MYREN, RUBEN NYGREN, P. ALFRED PETERSON, JOHAN ERIK ROSENBERG, JOSEPH ROSENIUS, BENGT STENMARK, GUNNAR SVEDLUND, BIRGER WARDH, PONTUS WIKNER, VALDEMAR WILLEN. **Ukrainian:** MARIA ADAMOVSKA (*UH*), KHRYSTYA ALCHEVSKA (*UW*), FED. ATAMANIUK (*UH*), OL. BABIY (*Uk. Rob., UW*), F. BARTOSH (*UH*), NUSIA BILOUS (*NS*), A. BODNAR (*NG*), MYKOLAYA BOZIUK-SZTEFUCOWA (*UW*), YA. BUBNIUK (*NS*), I. CHEREVKO (*UH*), LEONID CHLIBIW (*UW*), IVAN DANYLCHUK (*UH*), HR. DONETS (*NG*), M. DUBOVYK (*NG*), HONORÉ EWACH (*UH*), PETRO GORGAN (*NS*), M. HARASYMIUK (*NS*), A. HLIBOR (*NG*), M. HORISHNY (*UH*), O. HORYTSVIT (*UH*), BARBARA HRODSKA (*NG*), ONYSYA HRYNIUK (*NG*), PETRO HRYTSAY (*NG*), OLGA HUDZENKO (*NG*), OLEKSA HUREJIV (*NG*), M. IGNATENKO (*NG*), M. KACHMAROVA (*UH*), SYLVESTER KALYNETS (*UH*), PETRO KARPENKO (*NG*), V. KATSAVAL (*UH*), IVAN KMETA ("Miroslav Ichnyansky") (*NS*), MARUSYA KONDZELYA (*NS*), S. KOTYK (*UH*), ULIANA KRAVCHENKO (*Bud. Nat., UH*), MICHAEL KUMKA (*UH*), ROMAN KUPCHYNSKY (*UF*), T. KURPITA (*UH*), MYKOLA LEBEDYNSKY (*UW*), V. LYASHUK (*UH*), MYKYTA MAHYR (*UW*), A. MALYSHKO (*NG*), MIKHAL MARTINIUK (*UH*), MYKOLA MATIYIV-MELNYK (*UW*), MUSIY MUKHA (*UH*), STEPAN MUSIYCHUK (*NS*), MARYA MYRONEC (*NG*), W. NOSENKO (*NG*), IVAN NOVOSAD (*UH*), B. NYZSANKOWSKY (*UH*), BUYKO OLES (*UH*), SOFIYA OLINYK (*NS*), IVAN ONUFRYK (*UH*), STEPAN PALI (*UW*), I. A. PAVCHUK (*UH*), MYROSLAV PETRIV (*UH*), M. PIDHIRYANKA (*UH*), ANDRIY PORTENKO (*NG*), M. RILSKY (*NG*), MYKOLA RISHKO (*UW*), A. ROMANIUCHKA (*UH*), STEPAN SEMCHUK (*UW*), SVITLYANA SEREBRYANA (*NG*), MYKOLA SHAPOVAL (*NG*), YURA SHKRYMELIAK (*UW*), MYKOLA SHPAK (*NG*), HANNA SKAKUN (*UH*), VOLODYMYR SOSYURA (*NG*), M. STARCHUK (*UH*), IRYNA SUPRUNOVICH (*KF*), WASYL SURMACH (*UW*), MYKOLA SYDOR (*NS*), OLGA SYROTYNSKA (*UH*), IVANKA TRESHNEVSKA (*UW*), MARIYA TSERBAK (*UH*), WASYL TSURAT (*UW*), WASYL TULEWITROW (*Uk. Rob.*), AGATA TURCHYNSKA (*NG*), PAVLO TYCHYNA (*NG*), A. VILNY (*NG*), Y. VILSHENKO (*UW*), TARAS D. VOLAHATUKE (*NS, Svit Dytyny*, Lwow, *Ukr. Vistnyky*, Cartert, N.Y., and *Vistnyk*, Lwow.), D. E. YANDA (*UH*), DMYTRO ZAKHARUK (*NG*), R. ZAVADOVICH (*UH*).

IV. FICTION

Budzynowsky (W.), Pryhody Zaporozhkykh Skytaltsiv (Ukr. "Adventures of dusty wanderers;" serial in *KF*). **Chaykowsky (Andriy)**, Kozatska pomsta (Ukr. "Cossack bridge;" serial in *KF*). **Finnsdóttir (Gudrún H.)**, Hillingalönd (Icel. "Land of mirage"). Reykjavik, Fjelagprentsmidjan, 224pp. **Grochowska (Wanda)**, Ciernistym Szlakiem (Pol. "By a thorny path;" serial in *Gazeta Katolicka*). **Horlis-Horskiy (Yuriy)**, Kholodniy Yar (Ukr. "Cool ravine;" serial in *NS*). **Kanonikoff (Ivan)**, Paa Bunden av Skagerak (Nor. "On bottom of Skagerak;" serial in *Norr.*). **Martens (P. K.)**, Dirk Tellner: Eine historische Geschichte aus dem Leben der Mennoniten in Pennsylvanien (Ger. "D.T.: An historical story from life of Mennonites in Pennsylvania;" serial in *MR*). **Melan (E. J.)** tr., Ljósheimar (Icel. "Light of the world;"

serial in *Hkr.*). **Mniszek (Helena)**, Dziedzicstwo (Pol. "The inheritance;" serial in *Czas*). **Sollanych (Dmytro)**, Na pokladi Odriyi (Ukr. "In bed of Oder;" serial in *KF*). **Stroemberg (Leonard)**, Göran Malmsjö (Sw. "George Malmsjö;" serial in *CP*).

Short stories by the following selected writers have appeared: Narodnya Bayka (*UH*), Jóhann Magnús Bjarnason (*TTI*), Emma Drevits (*CP*), Gudrun H. Finnsdóttir (*TTI*), Ole Fjáten (*CP*), O. Holovko (*NG*), "Mykola Ichnyansky" (*KF*, *UH*), Hans Junior (*Norr.*), Peter J. Klassen (*Der Courier*, *Der Hausfreund*), Franz Kokowsky (*UW*), Kristína í Watertown (*Hkr.*), Thorvald A. Larsen (*Norr.*), W. Makey (*UW*), Victor Myren (*CP*), Anton Pohlkamp (*Ndw.*), Anders Moe Rognhaug (*Norr.*), Dmytro Sollanych (*NS*), Arkhyr Teslenko (*NG*).

V. DRAMA

Luhovy (Alexis), Bez vyny karani (Ukr. "Punished without guilt." Winnipeg, Ukrainian Bookstore, 66pp.); V listopadovy nich ("On a night in November") and V dnyakh slavi ("In days of glory") (Toronto, Ukrainian Pub. Co., 59pp.).

A. J. Loewen, Am Christabend (Ger. "On Christmas Eve" *Bote*). G. Loewen, Freuden und Leiden (Ger. "Joy and suffering" *Bote*).

VI. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE

A. Biography and Autobiography

Andriyevsky (A. M.), Polkovnyk Evgen Konovalets (Ukr. "General Eugene Konovalets;" serially in *Ukr. Rob.*). **Klassen (Peter J.)**, So war es, 1900-1930 (Ger. "Thus it was, 1900-1930;" serially in *Der Herold*, Newton, Kansas). **Santha (Pal.)**, Huszezer mertföld a Csendes Oceánon (Hung. "20,000 miles on Pacific Ocean;" serially in *KMU*). **Stephansson (Stephan G.)**, Bréf og ritgerdir, vol. I, fascicle I, ed. Dr Rögnvaldur Pétursson (Icel. "Letters and essays"). Reykjavík, Ríkiprentsmidjan Gutenberg, 192pp.

Richard Beck, Olafur Tryggvason Johnson (*Hkr.*). J. Magnús Bjarnason, Páll Halldorsson (*Hkr.*). David H. Epp, Peter Lepp, der Vater des deutschen Fabrikindustrie in unseren Kolonien ("P. L., father of German manufacturing in our colonies" *Bote*). Honoré Ewach, 64 short biographies in series Vyznachni Ukrayinski Zhinki ("Prominent Ukrainian women") (*UH*). G. Loewen, Dr. Bernhard Schellenberg (*Warte*), Meine erste Lehrerjahre ("My first years of teaching" *Bote*). Rögnvaldur Pétursson, Thordur Brynjólfsson Veum, 1846-1888 (*Hkr.*). W. Sienko, Wisla do Sandomierz ("By Vistula to Sandomierz" *Czas*), Zapomniana chala ("Forgotten house," memoirs, *Czas*).

B. Sketches: Narrative, Descriptive, Reflective, and Humorous

Gudrun H. Finnsdóttir, Hugsunarfrelsi ("Liberty of thought" *Hkr.*). G. Loewen, Ein Eisgang auf dem Dnjepr ("An ice-drive on Dnieper" *Bote*), Kunst und Natur ("Art and nature" *Bote*), Vom Lachen und Weinen ("From laughter and tears" *Bote*). G. P. Luden, De Voortrekkersfeesten in Zuid-Afrika ("Pioneers' festivals in South Africa" *Hollandia*). Jacob Minsaas, Oeieblikksbilleder fra Norve ("Glimpses from Norway" *Norr.*). W. Sienko, Nasze Polesie ("Our Polesia" *Czas*). Dmytro Sollanych, Svyaty vechir na ukrayinskykh zemlyakh ("Holy Eve in Ukrainian lands" *KF*). B. H. Unruh-Karlsruhe, Sippenkunde ("Genealogy" *MR*).

C. Critical Essays

Richard Beck, Grimur Thomsen og Byron (Icel. "G. T. and Byron" *Lbg.*). Agust H. Bjarnason, Um Björn Gunnlaugsson (*TTI*). Michael Kumka, Joseph George Fedkovich (*UH*). Victor Kupchenko, Nash naybilshy

natsionalny yubyley ("Our greatest national jubilee, Shevchenko" *UW*). W. Maruniak, V 140 richnitsiu "Eneyidy" Ivana Kotliarevskoho ("On 140th anniversary of 'Aeneid' of Ivan Kotliarevsky" *NS*). W. Sienko, Kult Mickiewicza ("Cult of Mickiewicz" *Czas*), Z walony dab ("Fallen oak," article on death of Polish author, Andrzej Strug, *Czas*).

D. Writings on Religion

Amongst the numerous writers on religious subjects, the following may be mentioned: Gudmundur Arnason (*Hkr.*), Gottfrid Billing (*CP*), Jóhann Bjarnason (*Sgn.*), J. P. Braun (*MR*), J. B. Epp (*MR*), K. Forsman (*CP*), Anton Haglund (*CP*), Jacob H. Janzen (*Bote*, *MR*), Gustaf E. Johnson (*CP*), Jakob Jónsson (*Hkr.*), C. Lindoff (*CP*), G. Loewen (*Bote*), Rúnolfur Marteinsson (*Sgn.*), Edward F. Olson (*CP*), Philip M. Pétursson (*Hkr.*), Rögnvaldur Pétursson (*Hkr.*), Vilmos Tatter (*Világoság*), Wilhelm J. Toews (*MR*), B. A. Werklund (*CP*), Axel Wimar (*CP*).

E. Writings on Education

Richard Beck, Háskóli Islands (Icel. "University of Iceland" (*Lbg.*), Olson-safnid vid Manitobaháskólann (Icel. "Olson collection in Manitoba University" *Lbg.*). Honoré Ewach, numerous educational and scientific articles (Ukr.) in *UH*. M. Ivanchuk, Pochatky Shkilnytstva mizh Ukrayintsyamy v Manitobi (Ukr. "Beginnings of education among Ukrainians of Manitoba" *UH*).

F. Comment on Current Affairs

H. B. Janz, Kriegswehrlosigkeit (Ger. "Noncombatancy" *MR*). Ragnar Lundborg, Thjódarjettarstada Islands (Icel. "Status of Iceland in international law" *TTI*). W. Sienko, Droga Stalina do Faszyzmu (Pol. "Stalin's road towards Fascism" *Czas*), Dwa swiaty ("Two worlds" *Czas*), "Europa na Wulkenie ("Europe on a volcano" *Czas*). Mrs D. E. Yanda, numerous articles on women's part in Ukr. communal life, in Ukraine and in Canada (*UH*).

VII. SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HUMANITIES

Thorsteinsson (T. T.). Æfintyrid frá Islandi til Brasilíu ("Emigration from Iceland to Brazil"). Reykjavík, Isafoldarprentsmidja, 398 pp.

O. Leon Caliński, Konstytucja 3-go Maja (Pol. "Constitution of third of May" *Gaz. Kat.*). Stefán Einarsson, Shakespeare á Islandi (Icel. "Shakespeare in Iceland" *TTI*). Jakob Horodsky, Pavlo Tychyna, Poet Ukrayinskoho Narodu (Ukr. "Paul Tychyna, poet of Ukrainian nation" *NG*). Rögnvaldur Pétursson, Forn-íslenzkir thjodsöngvar og althydusöngvar (Icel. "Old Icelandic national song and popular song" *Hkr.*).

VIII. HANDBOOKS

Karabut (Nicholas), Kanadiyske Pasichnytstvo (Ukr. "Canadian beekeeping," 32pp.); Sadivnytstvo v Zakhidniy Kanadi (Ukr. "Hardy fruits for Western Canada," 64pp.). Winnipeg, Rundschau Pub. House.